1 2	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA ATLANTA DIVISION			
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, :			
4	vs. DOCKET NUMBER			
5	: 1:15-CR-109-AT-3 RYAN VINCENT HILL,			
6	: ATLANTA, GEORGIA DEFENDANT. : JANUARY 23 - 26, 2017			
7	TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL (EXCERPTED) PROCEEDINGS			
8	BEFORE THE HONORABLE AMY TOTENBERG UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE			
9	VOLUME III OF IV			
LO	APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:			
L1	FOR THE GOVERNMENT:			
L2	JOHN S. GHOSE			
L3	RICHARD MOULTRIE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE			
L 4				
L5	FOR THE DEFENDANT:			
L6	ALBERT L. NORTON, JR. NORTON & ASSOCIATES, P.C.			
L7				
L8				
L9				
20				
21				
22	MECHANICAL STENOGRAPHY OF PROCEEDINGS AND COMPUTER-AIDED TRANSCRIPT PRODUCED BY:			
23	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER: SHANNON R. WELCH, RMR, CRR			
24 25	2394 UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE 75 TED TURNER DRIVE, SOUTHWEST ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303 (404) 215-1383			

1		INDEX TO VOLUMES
2		
3	VOLUME I	PAGES 1 - 101
4	VOLUME II	PAGES 102 - 347
5	VOLUME III	PAGES 348 - 455
6	VOLUME IV	PAGE 456 - 463
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

		1
1	INDEX TO PROCEEDINGS	
2		
3		PAGE
4	<u>JANUARY 23, 2017</u>	
5	PRELIMINARY INSTRUCTIONS	
6	by The Court	16
7	OPENING STATEMENT	
8	by Mr. Moultrie	27
9	by Mr. Norton	32
10	THE GOVERNMENT'S CASE WITNESS	PAGE
11	WILLIE HARPER	
12	Direct Examination	
13	by Mr. Ghose Cross-Examination	47
14	by Mr. Norton	78
15	EDWARD SMART	
16	Direct Examination by Mr. Ghose	80
17	Cross-Examination by Mr. Norton	88
18	JANUARY 24, 2017	00
10	DANOARI 24, 2017	
19	VADA FANIEL	
20	Direct Examination by Mr. Ghose	112
21	Cross-Examination by Mr. Norton	144
22		111
23	AYRION CHANDLER	
24	Direct Examination by Mr. Ghose	153
25	Cross-Examination by Mr. Norton	165

1	(cont'd)	
2	WITNESS	<u>PAGE</u>
3	JERALD LAWSON	
4	Direct Examination	178
5	by Mr. Ghose Cross-Examination	
6	by Mr. Norton Redirect Examination	194
7	by Mr. Ghose	198
8	JAMIR DENSON	
9	Direct Examination by Mr. Moultrie	205
10	Cross-Examination	231
	by Mr. Norton	231
11	KAYODE ADELEYE	
12	Direct Examination by Mr. Moultrie	254
13	Cross-Examination by Mr. Norton	308
14	Redirect Examination	340
15	by Mr. Moultrie	340
16	<u>JANUARY 25, 2017</u>	
17	JORDAN PEYTON	
18	Direct Examination by Mr. Ghose	359
	Cross-Examination	
19	by Mr. Norton Redirect Examination	365
20	by Mr. Ghose	374
21	* * *	
22	CHARGE CONFERENCE	348
23	CLOSING ARGUMENT	
24	by Mr. Ghose	388
25	by Mr. Norton by Mr. Ghose	397 425

_		
1	(cont'd)	
2	CHARGE	
3	by The Court 433	
4	<u>JANUARY 26, 2017</u>	
5	VERDICT 456	
6	POLLING OF THE JURY 457	
7	CERTIFICATE 464	
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

PROCEEDINGS OF JANUARY 25, 2017.

THE COURT: Good morning. Please have a seat. I hope I haven't gotten anyone sick spewing forth my coughing here.

Okay. I gave you via Ms. McConochie the jury instructions. Obviously, the first highlight I brought to your attention on Page 2 was just simply dependent on whether Mr. Hill testified or not. And we'll modify according to what he decides to do.

And the one on Page 9 -- I just wasn't sure the form of the indictment was that was being given. I wanted to see it again. And then I thought it might be a -- is it confusing to use the word separate? It is a separate federal crime on that -- saying to use or carry a firearm if you look on Page 9, that language.

MR. GHOSE: We don't think it is confusing, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So what did you mean exactly? I mean, what does it mean there where we're just -- we're actually only talking about one crime we're charging him on or you're charging him on?

MR. GHOSE: I mean, I think from a juror's perspective, it is confusing that there is an armed bank robbery and then there is a use of a gun count. I think it helps to say, look, those are two separate counts, those are

1 two separate offenses. 2 THE COURT: And I think that's true except we have just been talking about Count 3 on Page 8. It probably doesn't 3 4 matter. 5 But do you have any view, Mr. Norton? I mean, this is probably dancing on the head of a pin. 6 7 MR. NORTON: Well, maybe not. You make a good point. 8 The bottom of Page 8 is directly talking about Count 3, and 9 then the next section is a separate crime. You could just say 10 it is a separate federal crime distinct from armed robbery to 11 use and carry a firearm, if you wanted to incorporate the 12 concept. 13 THE COURT: Well, I think it explains it later on in the paragraph -- the full paragraph after 1, 2. I'll just 14 15 leave it. 16 The reason -- I understand the Government's argument 17 as to United States vs. Hector. But I really think it is not either controlling or applicable here. 18 19 First of all, the United States vs. Hector is looked 20 at on a harmless error basis in terms of its affirmance even where there is an error. 21 22 Secondly, the conspiracy charge there related 23 specifically to the bank robbery. The conspiracy here is --

relates to a 1951 charge of interference of commerce by threats

or violence, which doesn't itself reference the use of a

24

```
1
     weapon.
 2
               But most of all -- and it is just really -- this is a
 3
    harmless error affirmance of a verdict. And I think that
 4
     Rosemond really does control what the -- what the jury
 5
     instructions should be here. So I'm not going to give the
 6
     Pinkerton -- requested Pinkerton charge.
 7
               Are there any -- I know the Government objects to
 8
           I note your objection --
     that.
 9
               MR. GHOSE: Yes.
10
               THE COURT: -- in advance. Because you very
11
     forcefully argued it yesterday.
12
                           We just reserve our objection.
               MR. GHOSE:
13
               THE COURT: That's fine. Are there any other
14
     objections to the proposed charge?
15
               MR. NORTON: No, Your Honor.
16
              MR. MOULTRIE: No, Judge.
17
               THE COURT: Okay. Good. I understand -- as to the
18
    verdict form, I didn't hear from the defendant on that. I know
19
     that the Government's expressed its objection to the
20
     defendant's proposed verdict form.
21
               MR. NORTON: I think the last version I saw of the
22
    Government's form was the one we started out with.
23
               THE COURT: Right. So I wanted to -- they are
     objecting to your proposed verdict form, and I wanted to know
24
25
     what your response to their objection was.
```

MR. NORTON: Well, what I was trying to get at with 1 2 that form -- and I'm not necessarily wed to that exact thing. But the concept that I was trying to get into it is there is a 3 4 distinction between the use of brandishing. There is a 5 difference in sentence, of course, five versus seven years. Now, I realize that the evidence in the case mostly 6 7 points towards brandishing. However, if the jury were to make 8 a distinction in time as to when -- if they were to find him 9 guilty and if they were to find him guilty because he -- there 10 was not a point in time when he -- what is the language? 11 late to be reasonably able to walk away. If they figure out 12 what point in time that was and decide that he is quilty 13 because he didn't walk away when he should have, then I suppose 14 we could also say, well, at that point in time was the gun being used or was it also being brandished? 15 16 So I think the idea of Rosemond incorporates this 17 idea of time about when one walks away -- discovery and the 18 time it is too late to reasonably walk away. So if that is a 19 possibility --20 THE COURT: I think it is theoretically a possibility. But in this case it looks like from the videos 21 22 just in terms of reality that it is an all or nothing 23 proposition because they had their guns out -- his codefendants 24 did from the get-go when they walked into the bank. 25 MR. NORTON: Let's say that the jury decides, you

```
1
     know, he didn't have advance knowledge. But you remember the
 2
     video and still when they are walking in the vestibule. And
    Mr. Hill comes in last, and Mr. Brown is standing there, and
 3
 4
     you can't see the gun at that point.
 5
               It looks like he is kind of doing this. He has got
     it down here. He has got it down here for a guite a bit as
 6
 7
     Hill gets well into the place.
 8
               There is debate about whether or not Hill would have
     seen it at that point. Well, was he brandishing that firearm?
 9
10
     I think a juror could conclude that, well, he saw it then.
11
     was only being used at that point, and he should have walked
     away at that point.
12
13
               THE COURT: What about that last argument?
               MR. MOULTRIE: Judge, these are all defense arguments
14
     in terms of the theories of how the case occurred, all of which
15
16
    Mr. Norton will be able to argue appropriately. But there is
17
     no need to tinker with the verdict form. The verdict form that
     we submitted is straight out of the pattern instructions.
18
19
               I think we attached the sample verdict form to our
20
     reply to Mr. Norton's response to our trial brief. And if not,
21
     Judge, I have a copy.
22
               THE COURT: I mean, I have what you originally
    proposed. Is that what you attached?
23
24
              MR. MOULTRIE: Yes.
25
               THE COURT: I have the original proposal. And then
```

```
1
     you had Judge Ross' verdict form. And you didn't have anything
 2
     else other than that.
               MR. GHOSE: Your Honor, I believe the --
 3
 4
               THE COURT: You had the -- I know I had the original
 5
    one that you submitted.
               MR. GHOSE: Well, the other attachment to the reply
 6
 7
     to the trial memorandum, in addition to Judge Ross' verdict
 8
     form, is the pattern instruction for brandishing. And I wanted
 9
     to just make it clear that that pattern instruction --
10
               THE COURT: I just want to see where --
11
               MR. MOULTRIE: Judge, we have the pattern instruction
12
           I'll get it for you.
13
               THE COURT: Because what I have is just simply -- at
     least what I printed was Exhibits 1, which was Judge Ross', and
14
     2, which was your Pinkerton charge.
15
16
               MR. MOULTRIE: So, Your Honor, the -- you can just
17
    borrow my pattern book, Eleventh Circuit 2016 edition.
                                                             It is
     going to be at Page 236. It is a special verdict form.
18
19
               THE COURT: I'm sorry. Are you asking me to look at
20
     35.2?
21
               MR. MOULTRIE: Just the special verdict form, Your
22
     Honor, where the specific reference is made to how the wording
23
    of the finding as to brandish is recommended to be worded.
24
               THE COURT: We, the jury, having found the defendant
25
    quilty of the offense charged further find that with respect to
```

```
1
     count -- the firearm was -- and then it has in brackets
 2
    brandish or discharge?
 3
               MR. MOULTRIE: Yes.
 4
               THE COURT: I guess he might argue that that should
 5
    be brandish, possessed.
               MR. MOULTRIE: No. Judge, I'm suggesting that is not
 6
 7
     correct. Because if you look at the first finding -- the first
 8
     finding of guilt or innocence, it is as to the use or carrying
    of a firearm.
 9
10
               THE COURT: Yes.
11
               MR. MOULTRIE: So only after they have decided guilt
12
    or innocence on that question do they even reach the question
13
    of whether -- right.
               And the only other point I would make, Your Honor, is
14
     I think there's part of the pattern instruction that Mr. Norton
15
16
     continues to miss. It is a jumbled-up pattern instruction.
17
     it makes sense. I fully acknowledge that.
               But this is important. There is no requirement that
18
19
     the jury find that Mr. Hill had advance knowledge that a
20
     firearm would actually be brandished. That is not a finding
     that the jury has to make. And that is what you're going to
21
22
     instruct them. It is in the pattern instruction you have
23
    provided us.
24
               So this notion of any additional fact finding that
25
     the jury needs to do is just not proper based on the pattern
```

```
1
     instruction that you'll be giving the jury. They are going to
 2
     make a decision on guilt or innocence in use and carrying. And
     then there only has a finding that a participant brandished a
 3
 4
     firearm.
 5
               THE COURT: Okay. Well --
                              It is just that simple.
 6
               MR. MOULTRIE:
 7
                          I think the only thing I would say is
               THE COURT:
 8
     that I'm comfortable at this juncture with the pattern charge.
 9
     I think we have to have the note that is in the actual language
10
     here which your proposed verdict form didn't have where it
11
     says, note, if you find the defendant not quilty as charged in
     count blank, you need not consider the paragraph below.
12
13
               Do you want to see that?
               MR. NORTON: I think I understand. But sure.
14
15
               Well, I agree with that as far as it goes. But I
16
     just reserve the objection that I stated earlier.
17
               THE COURT: That is fine. And I understand your
           But I really do think that it is a -- either Mr. Hill
18
19
    was in a position to be able to -- it is either he didn't know
20
    and he couldn't withdraw or not. And I understand the
21
     distinction you're drawing. But I think it is argument, and it
22
     is not -- frankly, the more compelling thing is either he just
23
     was sabotaged by his -- as you argued by his more experienced
24
    peer who was really driving the thing or wasn't.
25
               I think that is the likely -- that's the fact
```

```
1
     situation that the jury is going to have to decide. But I'll
 2
     add the note because I think -- I think it is an important one.
    And I like -- I would like to also add his name just to
 3
 4
    personalize it.
 5
               MR. MOULTRIE: Your Honor, does the indictment look
    okay?
 6
 7
               THE COURT: The indictment -- have you looked at the
 8
     indictment?
 9
               MR. NORTON: Yes, ma'am.
10
               THE COURT: Do you have any objections?
11
               MR. NORTON: Well, Your Honor, honestly, I have not
12
    been in this situation before where I have had a partial case
13
    with a partial plea of guilty and going to trial on one count.
     It seems like that you give the jury the charging document when
14
15
     you go out, and that is normally the indictment.
16
               In this case, the indictment includes charges that
17
    are not at issue. So why go to the jury when they are not an
     issue? There is no secret to the jury that he did plead guilty
18
19
    to those things.
20
               But it seems like -- consistent with what the theory
     is behind giving the charging document to the jury, it would
21
22
     just be the 924(c).
               THE COURT: Well, we've referenced it. It is in the
23
24
    evidence. He has pled to it. I think it is -- it is relevant.
25
    And I'm happy to give them an instruction if you want. But I
```

```
1
     think I already have. But I can emphasize that they are only
 2
    to focus on Count 3 once again.
              MR. NORTON: That would be fine, Your Honor.
 3
 4
               MR. MOULTRIE: Your Honor, what is your practice -- I
     can't recall -- when you provide the jury with the indictment?
 5
     Is it before closing or after?
 6
 7
               THE COURT: After. After closing.
 8
               MR. MOULTRIE: Well, I have got the copies when
 9
     you're ready. Do you want them?
10
               COURTROOM DEPUTY CLERK: I have a copy. But you can
11
    give another one.
12
               THE COURT: I mean, I give it with --
13
               COURTROOM DEPUTY CLERK: With the exhibits.
               THE COURT: -- the exhibits. So I'll take a look at
14
    the language. But if there is something you in particular want
15
16
     when you look at the description of the indictment or the --
17
    or Count 3. If there is something in particular in terms of
     the language you want, you need to --
18
              MR. NORTON: As far as instruction?
19
20
               THE COURT: Yes.
21
               MR. NORTON: No. It would just be that the only
22
     charge for you to decide is Count 3. The other two he has pled
23
    quilty to.
24
               THE COURT: Do you mind if I steal this for a moment
25
    so I can give this to Ms. Cole?
```

```
1
               MR. MOULTRIE: We trust you.
 2
               THE COURT: We'll take a break for a second, and I'll
     explain it to her and one other so that we can start producing
 3
 4
     things.
 5
               And maybe you could get your next witness in here.
 6
    Who is your witness?
 7
               MR. GHOSE: It is Jordan Peyton, the final witness,
    Your Honor.
 8
 9
                           I'm sorry?
               THE COURT:
10
              MR. GHOSE: Jordan Peyton. He is a bank teller.
11
               THE COURT: All right.
              COURTROOM SECURITY OFFICER: All rise. Court is in
12
13
    recess.
                     (A brief break was taken at 10:06 A.M.)
14
               THE COURT: Please have a seat. So right in that top
15
16
    paragraph, you can see where it flowed from Page 8 because you
17
    have the other one. This is how I dealt with it. See how --
18
               We can talk about it later. But you can take a look
19
    at it now anyway.
               All right. Should we call the jury in?
20
               MR. GHOSE: Yes, Your Honor.
21
                     (The jury entered the courtroom at 10:16 A.M.)
22
23
               THE COURT: Good morning. Sorry you had to wait for
24
    us.
25
              Mr. Ghose, who is your next witness? We have him
```

```
1
     here. But go ahead and introduce him.
 2
               MR. GHOSE: Yes, Your Honor. The next witness is
 3
     Jordan Peyton.
 4
               COURTROOM DEPUTY CLERK: Good morning, sir. Please
 5
     raise your right hand.
 6
                      (Witness sworn)
 7
               COURTROOM DEPUTY CLERK: Please pull up close to the
 8
    microphone so everyone can hear you. Please just state your
 9
     name again for the record, and please spell your last name for
     the record.
10
11
               THE WITNESS: My name is Jordan Peyton. Last name is
12
    P-E-Y-T-O-N.
13
          Whereupon,
14
                              JORDAN PEYTON,
          after having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:
15
16
                            DIRECT EXAMINATION
17
    BY MR. GHOSE:
18
          Morning, Mr. Peyton.
     Q.
19
     Α.
         Morning.
20
     Q.
          Could you tell the jury where you work.
21
          Currently, I work for a company called Paychex.
22
     Q.
          Were you previously with Wells Fargo?
23
     Α.
          Correct.
24
     Q.
          What job did you have with Wells Fargo?
```

I was a personal banker.

25

Α.

- 1 Q. When did you leave Wells Fargo?
- 2 **A.** I left in 2015.
- 3 Q. All right. Were you -- what time? When in 2015?
- 4 **A.** June.
- 5 | Q. Were you working at -- are you familiar with the Wells
- 6 | Fargo branch that is at 979 Virginia Avenue in Atlanta?
- 7 **A.** Correct.
- 8 Q. Did you work at that branch?
- 9 **A.** Yes.
- 10 | Q. Were you working at that branch on February 27, 2015?
- 11 **A.** Yes.
- 12 **Q.** Okay. In the morning?
- 13 **A.** Yes.
- 14 Q. What position did you have on that day?
- 15 A. I was a personal banker.
- 16 Q. Can you describe kind of the layout of the bank and where
- 17 | you were sitting on that day.
- 18 | A. So it is a really small branch. It is a very open layout.
- 19 | I was actually the first desk inside the branch. So I was the
- 20 | first point of contact when you walk in the branch.
- 21 MR. GHOSE: Could you put up Exhibit 3, please.
- 22 AUSA ASSISTANT: I'm sorry. What was it?
- 23 MR. GHOSE: Exhibit 3. Let's try Exhibit 4.
- 24 | Q. (BY MR. GHOSE) Okay. Using the photograph that is on
- 25 | your screen, can you just point out to the jury -- you can

- 1 | actually draw on that screen. It is a touch screen -- where
- 2 | you were sitting?
- 3 A. (The witness complies.)
- 4 Q. Were you with a -- so were you there at around 9:30 that
- 5 morning?
- 6 **A.** Yes.
- 7 | Q. Were you with a customer or anything?
- 8 **A.** No.
- 9 \mathbf{Q} . What happened at 9:30 on February 27, 2015?
- 10 | A. Well, I was sitting at my desk just doing something on my
- 11 | computer. And three men ran through the door. The first --
- 12 | the first guy was a bigger guy. He ran in. And he had -- as
- 13 he ran in, I saw the gun out. He jumped the counter.
- 14 The second man came through the door. And he kind of
- 15 | manned the front door kind of where this picture is taken.
- And the third guy came in. He had his hand in his pocket,
- 17 | and he -- he ran behind the teller line.
- 18 MR. GHOSE: Okay. Could we have Exhibit 20, please.
- 19 | Q. (BY MR. GHOSE) All right. So there's three men?
- 20 A. Correct.
- 21 **Q.** There's two men here in this photograph. Which one came
- 22 in first?
- 23 A. The bigger guy in the front with the white on his face.
- 24 **Q.** Which guy came in second?
- 25 **A.** The guy behind the intro sign.

- 1 MR. GHOSE: Exhibit 21.
- 2 Q. (BY MR. GHOSE) And then who came in third?
- 3 | A. The guy with the gray hoodie.
- 4 MR. GHOSE: Okay. Could we have Exhibit 22, please.
- 5 | I'm sorry. 22. And then 23.
- 6 Q. (BY MR. GHOSE) All right. So is this -- in Exhibit 23,
- 7 | the person depicted in this exhibit, is this person you said --
- 8 | did you say someone guarded the door?
- 9 A. Yes. Essentially manned the door.
- 10 MR. GHOSE: Take it down, please.
- 11 Q. (BY MR. GHOSE) Okay. All right. So tell us -- so tell
- 12 | us what each robber did respectively.
- 13 **A.** Okay. So the first guy, the bigger guy, ran in. He had
- 14 | the gun in his hand. He jumped the counter immediately. The
- 15 | second guy came in. He was the one who manned the door, and
- 16 | the third guy ran behind the counter.
- 17 As I'm sitting at my desk, the second guy told me to stand
- 18 | up and move away from my desk.
- 19 \mathbf{Q} . When you say the second guy, you're talking about the guy
- 20 at the door?
- 21 **A.** The guy at the door, correct. The second guy told me to
- 22 | stand up and move away from my desk. So I stood up, moved away
- 23 | from my desk, and put my hands up the entire time.
- 24 There was another banker behind me as well. And he told
- 25 | him to do the same thing.

- Q. Did you comply?
- 2 **A.** Yes.

- 3 Q. All right. Did you stay in that position with your hands
- 4 | up for the duration?
- 5 A. Correct. Yes.
- 6 Q. Did you continue to observe the bank robbery with your
- 7 hands up?
- 8 A. Yes. So where my desk is located, I can see the entire
- 9 | teller line. So I just stood there and just witnessed
- 10 everything that happened.
- 11 \mathbf{Q} . So tell us first with the guy guarding the front door, the
- 12 | second robber, did you have any interaction with him?
- 13 **A.** Only when he initially told me -- only when he initially
- 14 | told me to move away from my desk. So I moved away from my
- 15 desk.
- The only other interaction that was kind of towards me was
- 17 | the banker behind me -- I couldn't see what he was doing. But
- 18 | the bigger guy that was behind the counter told the guy at the
- 19 front to watch him. So he took a couple of steps towards me
- 20 and said, what are you doing? Move away from your desk.
- 21 | Q. Did either the big guy or the guy at the door make any
- 22 | threats to any of the bankers?
- 23 \mid **A.** Not the bankers. But the big guy made a threat towards
- 24 | the teller.
- 25 **Q.** What threat did he make?

- 1 | A. Told him to hurry up. He said if he doesn't hurry up
- 2 | somebody is going to die today. He also did a countdown from
- 3 like five down.
- 4 Q. So you could hear that --
- 5 A. Correct.
- 6 Q. -- even though you were on the other side of the bank?
- 7 | A. Yeah. The branch is really small. So I can hear most of
- 8 the stuff that happens in there.
- 9 Q. Can you describe for the jury since the video has no audio
- 10 | how loudly the --
- 11 **A.** So the guy was --
- 12 **Q.** -- how loudly the big robber said what he said?
- 13 **A.** He said it really loud. You know, aggressive tone. He
- 14 | said it really loud and for everyone to hear.
- 15 | Q. Did he -- specifically, did the guy at the door say
- 16 | anything that you can remember?
- 17 | A. He did. At one point, he said time, time, time.
- 18 \mathbf{Q} . What about the small robber? Did he say anything?
- 19 A. I couldn't hear him very well. If he said anything at
- 20 | all, he was probably the most calm -- the quietest one out of
- 21 all of them.
- 22 **Q.** At what point were guns drawn during the bank robbery?
- 23 | A. So I saw guns as soon as they ran through the door. So
- 24 | the first -- the first -- the bigger guy had the gun out as he
- 25 | ran through the door. He might have pulled it out as he was

- 1 | running through the door. But as he is jumping over the
- 2 | counter, I see the gun out. The guy that manned the door had
- 3 his gun in his hand the entire time. So I could see it as he
- 4 was standing at the door.
- 5 Q. Did both the big robber and the robber at the door have
- 6 | their guns drawn when the smallest robber came into the bank?
- 7 **A.** Yes.
- 8 Q. When the smallest robber came into the bank, did he
- 9 hesitate?
- 10 **A.** No, not that I could tell.
- 11 **Q.** Did he stop and turn around?
- 12 **A.** No. He continued directly to his path behind the teller
- 13 line.
- 14 Q. Did the smallest robber say anything to the other robbers?
- 15 A. No, not that I could tell.
- 16 Q. Did he have any reaction at all to the drawn guns?
- 17 | A. No. He just -- like I said, he continued on his path to
- 18 | behind the teller line. He was pretty calm throughout the
- 19 process.
- 20 MR. GHOSE: That's all I have, Your Honor.
- 21 THE COURT: Thank you.
- 22 (There was a brief pause in the proceedings.)
- 23 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 24 BY MR. NORTON:
- 25 \mathbf{Q} . Mr. Peyton, there is a sign that we're looking at that

- says Wells Fargo -- I can't really tell the rest of it. On the backside, it says something about an intro rate.
- Is that where that sign was located on that day in question, February 27?
- 5 A. The online banking sign was. I know that for a fact because it has always been there.
- Are you talking about the smaller sign right in front of the smaller sign right in fro
- 9 Q. Well, no. From the other pictures -- and depth can be a
 10 little deceiving. So that is why I'm asking. It looked like a
 11 tallish sign was fairly close to the door, so you would walk
- 12 in, and you would immediately encounter a fairly tall sign?
- 13 **A.** Where the black mat is?
- 14 Q. Well, closer than where it appears to be in this picture.
- 15 Is it correct -- what I'm asking you is: On the day in
- 16 question, February 27, if we're standing here at the doorway,
- wouldn't there be a tall sign, maybe not the one that we see
- 18 | further into the room -- but a fairly tall sign either on that
- dark mat right in front or at least much closer to the door?
- 20 \mathbf{A} . There was a sign, yes.
- 21 **Q.** But it is not in this picture?
- 22 **A.** No.

- Q. Okay. So the bank didn't look exactly like this on the
- 24 day in question?
 - **A.** The only thing that was different is there was a sign

- 1 there.
- 2 Q. Okay. How far away from the door would you say that that
- 3 | sign was?
- 4 A. I would say 5 feet or so.
- 5 \mathbf{Q} . 5 feet. So -- let's do it this way. I'll walk towards
- 6 you. You tell me when you think that I'm as close as that sign
- 7 | would be to somebody. You're standing at the door. I'm the
- 8 | sign -- moving sign. Okay.
- 9 A. About right there. Maybe a couple of steps back.
- 10 **Q.** This distance?
- 11 **A.** Yes.
- 12 Q. So if you're standing at the door and I'm the sign, where
- 13 | you would be sitting would be approximately where the court
- 14 | reporter is sitting?
- 15 **A.** Yes.
- 16 Q. Okay. The guy that came in the door, you said he had his
- 17 | gun drawn. Did you see when he drew his gun?
- 18 **A.** The first person that came through the door?
- 19 Q. I'm sorry. I made that confusing. Let's start with the
- 20 | first guy. So the first guy comes in. You said that he -- he
- 21 | had -- he took his gun out as he was coming in the door; right?
- 22 A. Correct.
- 23 Q. And at that point then, the smallest guy wasn't even in
- 24 | the vestibule yet?
- 25 \mid **A.** He wasn't in the building yet or at least in my point of

- 1 | sight yet.
- 2 Q. Okay. So the big guy did not have his gun drawn until he
- 3 | got to the door; correct?
- 4 A. As he -- to the first door -- as he is coming through the
- 5 door, I'm seeing him pulling out his gun.
- 6 Q. You actually saw him pull it out? You didn't think, oh,
- 7 | he pulled it because you saw it out? You actually saw him pull
- 8 | it out of his clothing?
- 9 A. Correct.
- 10 \mathbf{Q} . And it was not visible until he did do that?
- 11 A. Yeah. He pulled it out of his jacket as he is coming
- 12 | through the door. And as he is running through the lobby area,
- 13 he had it out.
- 14 Q. Right. So if you saw him actually pull it out of his
- 15 | clothing, where was he as best you can recall at the moment
- 16 | that they -- well, he was on the move; right? He was moving
- 17 | fast?
- 18 **A.** Yeah.
- 19 | Q. Okay. So can you say where exactly he was at the time
- 20 | that he was pulling the gun out?
- 21 | A. At the glass doors -- at the two glass doors. As he is
- 22 | coming through the glass doors -- the glass doors open. As the
- 23 | glass doors are opening, that is when I see the gun.
- 24 | Q. Got it. When you say the glass doors, you mean the inside
- 25 | set of glass doors?

- 1 A. Correct. I can't see the outside.
- 2 Q. Otherwise, you wouldn't have been able to see him at all.
- 3 A. Yeah. The ones inside the branch.
- 4 Q. So now I'm going to talk about the second guy that came
- 5 in.
- 6 Okay. Now, he's the one that stayed by the door?
- 7 A. Correct.
- 8 Q. Did you actually see him pull the gun out of his clothing?
- 9 A. No. As he came through, I saw -- I saw the gun. I didn't
- 10 | see him pull his out.
- 11 **Q.** And then you saw the third guy come in after that; right?
- 12 A. Correct.
- 13 Q. Is there a little bit of delay between the second guy and
- 14 the third guy?
- 15 **A.** A little bit.
- 16 Q. When the second guy, the guy that ended up standing at the
- 17 door -- when he -- after he pulled the gun out, for the first
- 18 | few seconds of this episode at least, he had the gun held down
- 19 | kind of tight by his side, didn't he?
- 20 **A.** It was by his side. I wouldn't say it was tight. But it
- 21 | was by his side.
- 22 **Q.** Okay.
- MR. NORTON: Just a second, please.
- 24 (There was a brief pause in the proceedings.)
- 25 MR. NORTON: Actually, let me do this. Could I have

- 1 Exhibit 22.
- 2 Q. (BY MR. NORTON) I just want to make sure I'm with you on
- 3 this. So I was asking about a sign. Do you see that sign at
- 4 | the bottom right on Exhibit 22?
- 5 **A.** Right.
- 6 Q. This sign says an intro rate?
- 7 **A.** Correct.
- 8 Q. That is what -- the other picture we looked at, Exhibit 4,
- 9 | shows -- doesn't show that sign, at least not located in that
- 10 position?
- 11 **A.** Uh-huh (affirmative).
- 12 | Q. So here Exhibit 22 as it appears is much closer to the
- 13 | door --
- 14 **A.** Uh-huh (affirmative).
- 15 **Q.** -- than what Exhibit 4 indicates?
- 16 **A.** Yeah. The picture before?
- 17 Q. Yes. Exhibit 4 is the one we looked at where they are
- 18 looking into the room from the door.
- 19 A. Uh-huh (affirmative).
- 20 THE COURT: Can you answer yes or no just simply for
- 21 | the record?
- THE WITNESS: Yes.
- 23 | Q. (BY MR. NORTON) Okay. There is a chair over there to the
- 24 | bottom right just above the Government's exhibit sticker?
- 25 **A.** Yes. That is my desk. The chair is for where the

- 1 customers sit.
- 2 Q. So that is a side chair for your desk?
- 3 A. Correct.
- 4 Q. Is the side --
- 5 A. It is in front. It is in front of me.
- 6 Q. Actually, if you're sitting at the desk -- let's say this
- 7 | podium is the desk and you're sitting here. That would be the
- 8 | chair over there?
- 9 A. Correct.
- 10 **Q.** And your -- the depth of your desk would be maybe about
- 11 like this?
- 12 **A.** I would say so.
- 13 **Q.** Something like that?
- 14 A. Maybe a little bigger. Around that.
- 15 **Q.** Maybe a little bigger than the depth of this podium?
- 16 | A. Just a little bit. It is about that size. Not much
- 17 bigger.
- 18 $| Q \cdot |$ I'm not trying to be precise. But if your desk is the
- 19 | size of this podium and you're sitting back here, that chair
- 20 | would be right over there?
- 21 **A.** Correct.
- 22 | Q. That's the chair we're looking at in the bottom right of
- 23 Exhibit Number 22.
- Let me ask this: Kind of right above and behind that
- 25 \mid chair that is across from your desk, do you see a little piece?

- 1 THE COURT: I just want to make sure the jury can
- 2 hear you while you're looking at the picture. Thank you.
- 3 | Q. (BY MR. NORTON) Looking again at this Government's
- 4 Exhibit 22, right above where the exhibit sticker is, there is
- 5 | the chair?
- 6 A. Uh-huh (affirmative).
- 7 | Q. That is what you describe as being a chair that is right
- 8 | across from the desk you sit at?
- 9 A. Correct.
- 10 \mathbf{Q} . Right above that, kind of behind that chair, is a little
- 11 | piece of what looks like a cubicle maybe?
- 12 A. Correct.
- 13 **Q.** That is what it is?
- 14 A. Yes. Basically. It is an open cubicle.
- 15 **Q.** Open meaning there is a couple of sides to it?
- 16 A. Yes. It is nothing closed off. It is like a small little
- 17 | closed off behind me. But it is not anything that blocks in
- 18 | the front and completely behind me.
- 19 \mathbf{Q} . You are still completely open to the middle of the room?
- 20 A. Correct.
- 21 **Q.** This is just to give a little visual wire divider from
- 22 | where your office area -- your desk area would be?
- 23 A. Correct.
- 24 | Q. So tell me if I'm perceiving this correctly from this
- 25 | angle. There is a right angle on this cubicle, and it looks

- 1 | like the corner of it is next to the wall?
- 2 A. Correct.
- 3 Q. So actually the side of the cubicle is not flat to the
- 4 | wall? It is at an angle so that it kind of comes out from the
- 5 wall?
- 6 A. Yeah. There is -- the wall, too, is angled as well. So
- 7 | it is kind of hard to describe. But the side of the cubicle is
- 8 basically parallel to the window.
- 9 Q. Okay. So I wanted to make sure I'm seeing what I think
- 10 | I'm seeing here. The chair that is across from your desk that
- 11 | is here in the bottom right of Government's Exhibit Number 22
- 12 | is a couple of feet at least away from the wall; right?
- 13 **A.** I would say so, yes. Couple of feet.
- 14 | Q. Okay. And also tell me if I'm perceiving this right
- 15 | because I'm just looking at pictures and you work there. That
- 16 | wall, the beige yellowish-looking wall there that has got -- it
- 17 | looks like a fire alarm over there and so on.
- 18 If you were to run your hand along that wall, the frame
- 19 | for the door is inset a few inches? Does that make sense? In
- 20 other words, when you are coming through the door, the door --
- 21 | the door is not -- the doorway -- the actual door is not
- 22 | completely flush with that wall? It is actually set back a few
- 23 | inches from the wall?
- 24 | A. Yes. I don't really -- can you just explain a little bit
- 25 better?

1 Well, what I'm getting to is: This chair that we've been 2 talking about that is right across from your desk, if you -- if you were to take a tape -- if you were to pull the chair over, 3 4 you know, directly parallel along the wall to right in front of 5 the door and then run a tape measure over to the door, it would be -- we don't know the precise distance. But it wouldn't be 6 7 right up next to the door? It would be two or three, maybe 8 more feet? 9 Α. Yes. 10 Q. Okay. 11 MR. NORTON: Thank you. 12 MR. GHOSE: Just a few questions on redirect. 13 Could we have Exhibit 22, please. REDIRECT EXAMINATION 14 BY MR. GHOSE: 15 16 So I just want to establish -- reestablish at this moment 17 with Exhibit 22 -- I want to try to establish what the robber with the blue gloves would have been facing. Okay. 18 19 So Exhibit 22 at this moment. Now let's look at 20 Exhibit 13. Based on what you recall, is this what he would have been facing? 21 22 Α. Correct. The teller line, yes.

Q. Go back to Exhibit 22. So as the smallest robber turns

into the bank and starts walking toward the teller counter,

Exhibit 13, this is what he sees?

23

24

```
1
    Α.
         Correct.
 2
               MR. GHOSE: No further questions.
               MR. NORTON: Nothing further.
 3
 4
               THE COURT:
                           Do you have any additional witnesses?
 5
               MR. GHOSE: No further witnesses.
               THE COURT: Do we have all of your exhibits? Have I
 6
 7
     ruled on all of your exhibits?
 8
               MR. GHOSE: I believe so.
 9
               THE COURT: May this witness be excused, gentlemen?
10
               MR. NORTON: Yes, Your Honor.
               MR. GHOSE: Yes, sir.
11
12
                           Thank you very much, sir.
               THE COURT:
13
               THE WITNESS: Thank you.
               MR. GHOSE: There's still some outstanding exhibits.
14
     If we could have a brief recess and consult with Your Honor.
15
16
               THE COURT: We're going to sort of see where we're
17
    going here. Would you excuse yourselves for a few minutes.
18
     Thank you.
19
                     (The jury exited the courtroom at 10:37 A.M.)
20
               MR. GHOSE: Regarding exhibits, Your Honor, the only
     ones that are outstanding, ones that have been offered but not
21
22
     ruled upon, are the Exhibits 80 through 85. Those are all
23
     still -- still images from the Avalon Ridge surveillance
24
    videos.
25
               Some of that evidence was admitted during Kayode
```

```
1
     Adeleye's direct examination. But the remainder, 80 through
 2
     85, which I offered and which Your Honor withheld judgment on
    or withheld ruling on, are still outstanding.
 3
 4
               So I guess we would move at this point to admit them
 5
     for the same reasons that Exhibit 77 through 79 were admitted.
 6
               THE COURT: Can I see them again?
 7
               MR. GHOSE: Yes, Your Honor.
 8
               THE COURT: I'm sorry. They are here. I'll get
     them. 80 to 85. Excuse me.
 9
10
               And I allowed in the ones he identified? 79 and --
11
    any others?
               MR. GHOSE: Yes. Those are the ones that
12
13
    Mr. Moultrie discussed with Kayode Adeleye, and those were
14
    admitted.
15
               THE COURT: Did somebody else identify the others?
               MR. GHOSE: Yes. Edward Smart on the first day of
16
17
    trial was the security video custodian basically, and he
18
     authenticated them.
19
               THE COURT: What was the -- I realize there was a
20
     relevance objection.
21
               MR. GHOSE: It was a little out of order. We were
22
     just trying to get the witness in for that day.
23
               THE COURT: What is the point of 84?
               MR. GHOSE: Well, 84 is similar to the other ones,
24
25
    which is that it is evidence of what Hill and the other robbers
```

```
1
     did after the bank robbery to show their coordination.
                                                             So it
 2
     is --
 3
               THE COURT: If you look at 84, it doesn't seem to
 4
     show me anything, really.
 5
               MR. GHOSE: Well, 84 is from that evening -- that
    evening when they went to retrieve the abandoned rental car,
 6
 7
     the Xterra.
 8
               I'm not sure, Your Honor. Actually, I think we
     should withdraw 84 because I don't think Mr. Adeleye addressed
 9
10
     what happened that evening.
11
               THE COURT: Yeah. I have the same problem as to 85.
12
     That is also at night.
13
               MR. GHOSE: Yes. I would withdraw 84 and 85. But
     83, 82, 81, and 80 are all relevant because they talk about the
14
    moments when they abandoned the white Mercedes and got into the
15
16
    minivan.
17
               MR. NORTON: Same objections as before.
18
               THE COURT: I think they can come in. But not 84 and
     85.
19
20
               MR. GHOSE: That is fine, Your Honor. And everything
    else, Your Honor, is in.
21
22
               THE COURT: All right. Are you closing your case at
23
    this time? Are you resting at this time?
               MR. GHOSE: Yes. The Government rests, Your Honor.
24
25
               MR. NORTON: Well, I have a motion. I think I have
```

```
1
     to make it when the jury -- I think there is some weird law
 2
    that suggests --
               THE COURT: About making it while the jury is
 3
 4
    present?
 5
               MR. NORTON: Right. If the Court likes, I can state
    the reasons now and then when the jury comes back just renew
 6
 7
     the motion so they don't have to keep coming back and forth
 8
    with the jury.
 9
               THE COURT: Why don't you state -- I don't know about
10
     it. But there are lots of things I don't know about, as it
11
     turns out, as I see every day. So I wouldn't want you to in
12
     any way commit error.
13
               So if you think that you need to, make it in front of
     the jury -- just the motion. But why don't you state the
14
     reasons now, and I'll just --
15
16
               MR. NORTON: So this would be the argument the Court
17
    has already heard when I make the motion.
18
               THE COURT: Just come forward.
19
               MR. NORTON: It is a sufficiency of evidence motion
20
    because -- I'm not going to argue all of the evidence the Court
     has certainly heard.
21
22
               But, really, what this comes down to is we're hearing
23
    a lot about -- an awful lot about the events inside of the
    bank. We're hearing about events after the robbery and then a
24
25
    very little bit about the events before.
```

And what our contention is is that, you know, if you break it up into those three time frames, the last bit -- everything after they leave the bank is really irrelevant. I understand the -- I mean, I see there is a tiny bit of relevance because they recovered the guns.

But to say that everything that happened after when they know they are made constitutes evidence of a plan, it seems like it is the exact opposite. So, you know, that is why I have been a little tentative about saying it is irrelevant because there's the guns recovered -- two guns recovered. But that is about the extent of the relevance that I can think of. And that can be disposed of in a sentence or two.

So although that is -- all of the time frame after that is almost entirely irrelevant, it is certainly prejudicial because we're retrying the bank robbery again.

Then the time during the bank, yes, it is relevant because you can draw inferences from what happens in the bank. But those inferences only go so far.

I'm not going to say there is no evidence. I'm saying there is insufficient evidence. And the really relevant time frame is everything that happened before they go into the bank.

Now, I understand we heard from Mr. Adeleye. But if you look at the circumstances and look at all the people involved, look at what we haven't heard, I maintain that that

```
1
     is -- should be deemed insufficient as a matter of law to
 2
     sustain the -- to support a conclusion -- a fact conclusion
     that Mr. Hill had advance knowledge such that it was -- he is
 3
 4
     in it too far and it is too late to reasonably be able to walk
 5
     away. So that is the basis for our motion.
 6
               THE COURT: Thank you.
 7
               MR. MOULTRIE: Your Honor, could I have a moment to
 8
    ask Mr. Norton a question?
 9
               THE COURT: Yes.
10
                     (There was a brief pause in the proceedings.)
11
               MR. MOULTRIE: Your Honor, it wouldn't be appropriate
12
    to make the Rule 29 motion in front of the jury. That happens
13
     now. I just wanted to make that point.
14
               Your Honor --
15
               THE COURT: Right. I'm just -- I just heard him say
16
    he felt he needed to do it.
17
               MR. MOULTRIE: All right.
               THE COURT: I thought Mr. Norton maintained he needed
18
19
    to do it in front of the jury. Not make the argument but make
20
    the motion.
               MR. NORTON: I feel like I need to make the motion in
21
22
    front of the jury.
23
               MR. MOULTRIE: That is just to say that I move but
24
    not state the reasons?
25
               THE COURT: That's right.
```

```
1
                           I was going to say I move to dismiss
               MR. NORTON:
 2
     and --
               THE COURT:
                           Why don't you just make the motion by
 3
 4
     reference to the rule and --
 5
               MR. NORTON: I make a motion pursuant to Rule 29.
               THE COURT: And then I'll say I deny it or I'll grant
 6
 7
     it for the reasons --
 8
               MR. NORTON: Very well.
 9
               THE COURT: All right.
10
               MR. MOULTRIE:
                              Thank you, Judge. Your Honor, the
11
     Court has heard the evidence. The jury not only had the
12
     benefit of the factual stipulation covering all the facts to
13
     which Mr. Hill agreed in terms of the planning of the armed
14
    bank robbery generally, including the fact that real firearms
    would be used during the course of the armed bank robbery, but
15
16
     they also heard direct testimony from one of the participants,
17
    Mr. Adeleye, who spoke directly to the issue of advance
18
     knowledge and testified before the jury that he received the
19
     gun used for the armed bank robbery directly from Mr. Hill not
     only on the date of the armed bank robbery but on the day prior
20
     to the date of the armed bank robbery.
21
22
               There is sufficient evidence for the charge to go
23
    before the jury based on the one defense that Mr. Hill is
     advocating. And that is, that he lacked the requisite advance
24
25
     knowledge a firearm would be specifically brandished during the
```

1 firearm (sic). 2 Of course, the Court has also seen the video footage that shows Mr. Hill entering the bank when the guns are 3 4 brandished and also continuing with the bank robbery after the 5 firearms were brandished. We ask that you deny the Rule 29 6 motion. 7 I'm going to deny the motion because I THE COURT: 8 think a reasonable jury could find either way. I think a 9 reasonable jury could find based on the evidence presented that 10 Mr. Hill either knew or was in a position to withdraw once he 11 saw the gun based on evidence presented. 12 But there is also reasonable evidence in the record 13 upon which a jury could determine the opposite. And it is really a jury question that I can't resolve myself. And there 14 is a sufficient foundation of evidence for it to go to the 15 16 jury. 17 Are you going to call any witnesses? MR. NORTON: Your Honor, it is suggested that this 18 19 would be the opportune time if the Court desires to address 20 Mr. Hill about his rights. 21 THE COURT: All right. 22 Mr. Hill, you know at trial -- and we went through 23 this some at your original plea proceeding on Counts 1 and 2 -you do have the right to testify and present your evidence in 24

this proceeding and your version of the events. But you also

25

```
1
     have the right to remain completely silent. You cannot be
 2
     forced to testify or produce any evidence or present any
    witnesses.
 3
               And if you choose not to testify here, the fact that
 4
 5
     you did not testify cannot be considered against you by the
     jury in determining whether you are guilty of the offense
 6
 7
     charged. But you do have the absolute right to testify if you
 8
     so choose.
 9
               Do you understand that?
10
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
11
               THE COURT: All right. Do you wish to discuss with
12
    your client at all further whether he wishes to proceed?
13
               I can go check on my verdict form meanwhile if you
14
    want a few minutes.
15
               MR. NORTON: I think it will just take a second.
16
               THE COURT: All right.
                     (A discussion ensued off the record between the
17
                     defendant and defense counsel.)
18
19
               MR. NORTON: I think we're resolved on that, Your
20
     Honor.
21
               THE COURT: Does he wish to proceed or not?
22
               MR. NORTON: We do not wish to proceed. We have no
23
    evidence.
24
               THE COURT: Mr. Hill, you understand that?
25
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
```

```
1
               THE COURT:
                          Do you have any witness -- other
 2
     witnesses to call?
 3
              MR. NORTON: No, Your Honor.
 4
               THE COURT: Okay. Well, then I'm going to go check
 5
     on my verdict form and modify the instruction accordingly so it
 6
     can be produced.
 7
               Do you need any time before we begin opening
 8
    arguments?
 9
              MR. GHOSE: No.
10
              MR. NORTON: No.
11
               THE COURT: So we'll begin opening arguments --
12
     closing arguments. Excuse me. You wanted 40 minutes. Do you
13
     still want 40 minutes?
              MR. GHOSE: 30 minutes for the first close and 10
14
    minutes for rebuttal.
15
16
               THE COURT: All right. And we'll take a break
17
    between the two closing arguments.
18
               All right. Is there any evidence that you wanted to
19
     submit that you have not had an opportunity to submit that you
20
     thought you had tendered or otherwise, Mr. Norton?
21
               MR. NORTON: For the defense, no, Your Honor.
22
               THE COURT: Okay. All right. Does the defense rest?
23
     I just want to make sure that you're not -- you're not trying
     to in any way introduce anything further? I just want to make
24
25
     sure that the evidence is closed.
```

```
1
               MR. NORTON: That is correct. I think I have to rest
 2
     when the jury comes back.
               THE COURT: All right. Very good. All right.
 3
 4
    think this will just take me a few minutes, and we'll get the
 5
     jury back.
               COURTROOM SECURITY OFFICER: All rise. Court is in
 6
 7
     recess.
                     (A brief break was taken at 10:54 A.M.)
 8
 9
               THE COURT: Please have a seat. I understand,
10
    Mr. Ghose, you want to change Number 2 to say, we, the jury,
11
     further find with respect to that count --
12
               MR. GHOSE: That a firearm.
13
               THE COURT: -- that a firearm.
              MR. GHOSE: That is my only suggested change, Your
14
     Honor.
15
16
               THE COURT: Do you have any objections to that?
17
               MR. NORTON: I'm sorry?
               THE COURT: Mr. Norton, do you have any objections to
18
19
     the change? I'll let you do the objections to the entire
20
     verdict form. But do you have any objections to the
     substitution of the article a for the?
21
22
              MR. NORTON: No objection to that.
23
               THE COURT: All right. Do you want to make any
24
     objections to the verdict form again just to renew them?
25
               MR. NORTON: Just to renew what I have already
```

```
1
     stated.
 2
              THE COURT: All right. Do we want to
    wait for the -- don't we need to wait for Mr. Moultrie for the
 3
 4
    closing?
 5
              MR. GHOSE: He actually said not to wait but --
 6
              THE COURT: For the closing? You want him to be
 7
    walking in?
              MR. GHOSE: I don't know where he went. He said
 8
 9
    don't wait for me. But he left. So --
10
              THE COURT: All right.
11
              MR. GHOSE: But I would prefer to have him here. I'm
12
    sure he will be here momentarily.
13
              THE COURT: Why don't I -- I hate to leave him out
    and have him come in in the middle.
14
15
              MR. GHOSE: Let me call him real quick.
16
              THE COURT: Why don't we see where he is. But I also
17
    would like to begin.
18
              MR. GHOSE: Right.
19
              THE COURT: So you take a look. I'll bring this back
20
    to Holly.
21
              COURTROOM SECURITY OFFICER: All rise. Court is in
22
    recess.
23
                     (A brief break was taken at 11:08 A.M.)
24
              THE COURT: All right. We'll go ahead and get the
25
     jury back.
```

```
1
                     (The jury entered the courtroom at 11:11 A.M.)
 2
               THE COURT: Mr. Norton -- does the Government rest?
               MR. GHOSE: Yes, Your Honor, the Government rests.
 3
 4
               MR. NORTON: Your Honor, we have a motion pursuant to
 5
     Rule 29 for the reasons we have previously stated.
               THE COURT: For the reasons I have stated, the motion
 6
 7
     is denied at this time.
 8
              MR. NORTON: The defense rests.
 9
               THE COURT: All right. The defense rests and doesn't
10
     wish to present any further testimony or evidence?
11
               MR. NORTON: Correct, Your Honor.
12
               THE COURT: All right. Very good.
13
               Ladies and gentlemen, then we are ready to hear
     closing argument in the case. And I have given the parties 40
14
15
    minutes apiece. Because the Government bears the burden of
16
    proof to establish its case, it goes first. And it may reserve
17
     some amount of time to respond to the closing argument provided
    by defense counsel. And my understanding is that that is what
18
19
     is going to occur here.
20
               So, Mr. Ghose, are you proceeding or Mr. Moultrie?
21
               MR. GHOSE: I am, Your Honor.
22
               THE COURT:
                          All right. Very good. What we're going
23
     to do, though, just simply so that you can pay maximum
24
     attention to counsel is, after the Government completes its
25
     closing argument, we're going to take a very short break so you
```

```
can stand and use the restroom if you need to. And then we'll
 1
     resume, and we'll hear from defense counsel. So I just want --
 2
     so we are really just having the shortest of breaks. And if no
 3
     one needs one at that time, we'll determine that at that point
 4
 5
     depending on really how long Mr. Ghose actually takes.
               And at the -- but the point is so that you can really
 6
 7
     focus on all of the words being thrown your way. It is a lot
 8
     of words. And at the conclusion of all of that, then I'm going
 9
     to give you the instructions on the law. And I think that will
10
     bring us approximately to 1:00. And then if we can do it by
11
     then, great. I have something I have to be speaking at at
12
     1:00. If not, then I'll give you the instruction of the law
13
     after lunch. And then you'll begin deliberations.
14
               MR. GHOSE: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.
                            CLOSING ARGUMENT
15
16
              MR. GHOSE: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.
17
               JURY PANEL: Good morning.
               MR. GHOSE: As you have heard, the defendant, Ryan
18
19
     Hill, has been charged with three counts in this case,
20
     Counts 1, Counts 2, and Counts 3. But the only count before
21
     you is Count 2 (sic). That is because, as you have heard, the
22
     defendant has already pled guilty to Count 1 and Count 2.
23
               Count 1 charged conspiracy to commit the bank robbery
24
     at the Virginia-Highland Wells Fargo on February 27, 2015.
25
    has pled quilty to that count, and you have heard the factual
```

basis that was read into the record.

Count 2 charged armed bank robbery. Now, an armed bank robbery can be done with any kind of weapon. And the defendant has pled guilty to that count as well. You have heard the factual basis for that as well.

What is left for you to decide is Count 3. Count 3 charges a separate offense that relates to the use of a firearm specifically during and in relation to a crime of violence. And in this case it is the armed bank robbery the defendant has already pled guilty to. So your decision — the facts that you have to decide is whether or not the defendant, Ryan Hill, is guilty of Count 3.

Count 3, I think Mr. Norton referred to it as a 924(c) offense at the beginning of this case. That is not that helpful to you. What will be helpful to you is to know what it is about. What it is about is the use of a firearm during that crime of violence.

You have heard during this case as you heard in the opening and now you will hear from me now that the Government does not contend that the defendant had a gun during this bank robbery. You saw the video during the trial. You saw his hands. He had no gun.

Some of the bank tellers have said that their memory from this ordeal is that he did have one. But that is not our contention. But that does not preclude his guilt. Ryan Hill

can -- under the law, Ryan Hill can still be guilty of Count 3 even if he didn't have a gun.

The reason for that is aiding and abetting. Okay. So what is aiding and abetting? Judge Totenberg has already instructed you actually on this. She'll instruct you again. But it bears repeating because that is what you have to decide.

Did Ryan Hill aid and abet Kayode Adeleye and Bruce Brown when they carried guns into the robbery of the Wells Fargo?

What is aiding and abetting? There's a couple of different instructions that you will be given in this regard. Aiding and abetting in general is when someone intentionally joins with someone else to commit a crime. They join together. They are held liable together.

But for Count 3, which charges a specific type of crime, there is more that you have to consider. Active participation. Judge Totenberg will instruct you that in order to be guilty for aiding and abetting, Count 3, Ryan Hill must have actively participated in the bank robbery.

I would submit to you that this is an easy decision to make. He has already pled guilty to the armed bank robbery, and there is no dispute that he actively participated in the bank robbery. You saw what he did. He admits that is him. He wore the blue gloves. He took away the money. He actively participated in the bank robbery. So that is not a significant

issue.

What is a more significant issue, as you heard

Mr. Norton refer to in the beginning and Mr. Moultrie as well:

Did Ryan Hill have advance knowledge that guns would be used

during this bank robbery? That is what this case is about.

That is what you have to decide.

That is why so much time is spent in this relatively short amount of trial about what exactly would Ryan Hill had to have known when he entered that bank. Did he know whether or not guns were going to be used during that bank robbery?

So there's two parts to this. Okay. You are going to hear the meaning of advance knowledge. But that instruction you'll hear -- when you hear the instruction from Judge Totenberg, advance knowledge can mean knowledge a week before, it can mean a day before, it can mean an hour before, it can mean a second before, it can even mean just after the bank robbery started if it is at a moment where the defendant can still walk away from it.

Okay. If he learns of that gun at a moment when he can still walk away from that offense, that is advance knowledge. If he learns of that gun at the very end of the offense or after it is over, that is not advance knowledge.

So I suspect that Mr. Norton is going to argue that Ryan Hill had nothing -- he didn't know that there were guns involved until either after the bank robbery was over or right

```
1
     until it was at the end and it was too late to walk away.
 2
               So your decision is did -- the decision you have to
    make is did he know before whether or not guns were going to be
 3
 4
     involved, knowing that advance knowledge could mean a week, a
     day, an hour, a second.
 5
               Okay. So what is advance -- let's -- and did Ryan
 6
 7
    Hill have that advance knowledge?
 8
               Could I have Exhibit 23, please. Actually, sorry.
    Exhibit 22. Yeah. 23. Let's do 23 first. Exhibit 23. Now
 9
10
     Exhibit 21. Okay. Now back to Exhibit 23.
11
              Look at Bruce Brown's gun. Has Ryan Hill entered
12
    that bank yet?
13
               Exhibit 21, please.
               Where is that gun? That gun -- he has got the gun
14
     out. He puts it by his side, and Ryan Hill is walking in.
15
16
     That gun is visible to Ryan Hill. Could he walk away at that
17
    moment if he didn't want to be a part of an armed bank robbery
    and use of a firearm during a crime of violence? Absolutely,
18
19
    he could have walked away.
20
               Did he -- did he flinch? Did he look surprised? Did
    he pause? Did he say anything to his fellow robbers like, what
21
22
    the heck are you doing? This is not how this was supposed to
23
     go. Of course not. Because this is part of the plan.
24
     that gun was going to be involved.
25
              Let's look at Exhibit 22, please.
```

```
1
               This is Ryan Hill walking in moments later, probably
     less than a second later. Where is Kayode Adeleye at this
 2
    moment? He came in first.
 3
 4
              Exhibit 13, please.
 5
               That is where he is.
               Exhibit 6, please. Sorry. Exhibit 3.
 6
 7
               Look at the size of this bank. Okay.
                                                      This is the
 8
    view that Ryan Hill had when he walked into the bank.
 9
               Exhibit 13.
10
               And that is what he saw. That is what he saw when he
11
    walked in. Did he have advance knowledge the moments before he
12
     started to participate in that bank robbery? Of course, he did
13
    because the guns were out.
               What else was out? Everyone's hands are up.
14
     Exhibit 8. I won't play it for you because I don't want to
15
16
     waste time. Exhibit 8 is the camera behind Vada Faniel's
17
    teller station. What did you see when we played that video?
              All three of them, Vada, his customer, and his other
18
19
    customer. Is this what you do when people walk in without
20
    guns? No. You do this instinctively because guns are drawn on
21
     you. That is what Ryan Hill saw when he walked in. Hands up;
22
    guns out.
               He was an active participant. He was a knowing
23
24
    participant with advance knowledge. He should be held -- and
25
    under the law, he should be held responsible for this offense.
```

1 But that is not all that you know about. It is also 2 what you heard. What did Kayode Adeleye say? What did he say during this robbery? What did each and every teller say to 3 4 some effect about what he said? Someone is going to die today. 5 Is that -- do you kill people when you walk in a bank without guns? When you are doing a strongarm robbery, you 6 7 wrestle them to death? No. You have guns. That is how 8 someone is going to die today. That is what Ryan Hill heard. Hands up; guns drawn. Someone is going to die today. And he 9 10 walked in there as Jordan Peyton said calm, collected because 11 everything was going according to their plan. That was the 12 plan. 13 Of course, that was the plan. Think about Willie Harper, the first witness that we put up. You have to go back 14 three days to Monday. Mr. Norton said there is a note job, 15 16 there is a takeover, and then there is this third category, the 17 strongarm takeover. The robbery where people go in dressed 18 like armed robbers but don't actually use guns. 19 What did Willie Harper tell you about that? No such 20 thing exists. People don't go in dressed like that --21 You can take that down, actually. 22 They don't go in dressed like that to wrestle people 23 to the ground. They go in with guns. How do you take over a bank without guns? How do you get a teller to freeze and not 24 25 press the panic button without a gun?

If I'm a teller -- there are six, seven, eight bank employees in this bank. Every one of them has a buzzer underneath their desk. How do I get them all to stand up and freeze and not hit that buzzer without guns? How do I get the teller to open the vault with 200,000 or whatever is in there without guns? Do I arm wrestle them? No. I point a gun at them, and I threaten them with their lives. That is how you do this.

It makes no sense. No sense. Your common sense should tell you that, of course, he knew that guns were going to be involved. Because the only other type of robbery that Willie Harper said in his 14 years, 10 robberies per year, 140 robberies that he's investigated over his time with Wells Fargo across Georgia -- has there ever been, he said, a takeover-style robbery without guns? No. Because the other style robbery that occurs is a note-passer, a note job.

How does this one work? Well, Willie Harper told you that you walk into the bank dressed like everybody else. No guns. No masks. No hoodies. No gloves. You come in looking like a regular customer. You get in line. You fill out your paper. You hand it to the teller. But what the note says is, I have a gun. Give me all your money. And the teller — tellers are actually trained to do that. Then they walk out like nothing happened. No one knows.

Could I get Exhibit 23.

Does that guy look like a note-passer to you? When Kayode Adeleye testified, all 6-6 of him or whatever he was -- did he look like a note-passer to you? Of course not. This was not a note job. This was a takeover robbery.

But, of course, there is more evidence than just what happened in the bank that day. That is because Kayode Adeleye testified and told you what happened before this robbery. He told you about the plan.

Ryan Hill didn't know about the gun just moments before. Although that would be sufficient to convict. Ryan Hill knew about this a week -- more than a week before. Ryan Hill had the wheels. Ryan Hill had the wheels. That is what Kayode Adeleye said. Meaning, he had the getaway car.

But he didn't just have the wheels. He had the brains. He -- he is the brains behind the operation. He is the brains, and Bruce Brown and Kayode Adeleye are your muscle. They are the goons who rough up the tellers and guard the door. And he is the one who is too smart to get caught with the gun.

You heard that Ryan Hill provided the getaway car.

That is the rental Xterra. Ryan Hill provided the switch car.

That is the white Mercedes. Ryan Hill identified the target

bank with Connie Montoya. Ryan Hill provided his gun to Kayode

Adeleye. Why? Because Adeleye is a convicted felon. He told

you that. He can't have guns. He doesn't walk around with

guns. Hill gave Adeleye his gun.

```
1
               And you know what? Adeleye said, I thought Hill was
 2
     going to have a gun. And the teller said, I thought that he
     had a gun. He walks in with his hand in his pocket like he had
 3
 4
     one. But he's too smart to get caught with it.
 5
               He is the brains behind the operation. No wheels.
    No brains. No bank robbery. If they had succeeded -- what did
 6
 7
     Kayode Adeleye say about how they would split the proceeds?
 8
     Evenly. Why? Because they had roles. They were in it
 9
     together.
10
              Brown held the door. Adeleye roughed up the tellers.
11
    Hill took the money. They need each of those parts to succeed.
12
     If they don't have all those parts, they don't succeed.
13
     succeed together. They should be held accountable together.
               That is why there is aiding and abetting liability.
14
     That is why the evidence in this case supports a finding of
15
16
     quilt on Count 3. Ryan Hill is quilty of Count 3. Thank you.
17
               THE COURT: All right. It wasn't so long that you
     shouldn't be able to proceed at this juncture.
18
19
               Are you ready?
20
               MR. NORTON: So go ahead?
               THE COURT: Yes.
21
22
                            CLOSING ARGUMENT
               MR. NORTON: Ladies and gentlemen, first, let me
23
24
     thank you for your attentiveness to the Court, and I appreciate
25
         I want to -- I want to say a couple of things really about
     it.
```

what the -- sort of the zoomed-out larger picture view of what it is we're here for and specifically what you're here for.

I'll get to that in a second.

But, first, while it is fresh on my mind, I want to speak to some of the things that the Government has raised in their closing. The format here is they get to speak to you. Then I get the last opportunity I'm going to have to speak to you about the evidence that you have heard and the issues that are in front of you. And that is what I'm doing right now. And they get a chance to come back.

But let me go ahead and speak to some of the things that have been presented to you so far. First of all, aiding and abetting. What is necessary to understand here is the -- you know, there's facts, and there's law. You have heard already and soon you'll hear again as you are being instructed by the Judge before you go out to deliberate that you're the finders of fact but the Judge determines what the law is.

Well, if you think about that -- I mean, that sounds like a nice clean separation. But it is not perfectly like that. It can't be because what facts are you going to find.

Well, ones that the law determines are relevant, pertinent to the issues, and the issues are framed by what the charges are. What law applies? Well, it depends on what the facts are. So there is a little bit of interaction there. And the form of that interaction is when the Judge gives you

instructions.

So the Judge is going to tell you what the law is so that when you go make determinations of fact you're making determinations of fact that are pertinent to the legal issues in play in this case. That is how it works. That is why the Judge's instructions to you are going to be so important.

So aiding and abetting, well, that is a legal concept. The concept is that you can be liable for something that somebody else does -- criminally liable. That is the essence of what aiding and abetting is. It is an indirect liability. Because as I have said and I'll probably say it again, Mr. Hill did not have a gun. Yet he has got a gun charge. Why does he have a gun charge? Because somebody else has a gun.

The charge is -- the contention is that he was aiding and abetting those people in having a gun. Not the bank robbery. That is off the table. But aiding and abetting them in having the gun is what the charge is.

Now, there is a limitation on aiding and abetting. You're not just automatically liable for anything that anybody else does that is also involved in the criminal act with you. Now, that limitation doesn't apply with respect to armed bank robbery. That is why he pled guilty to it.

But the limitation does apply to the gun charge. Let me explain that. That is where this phrase advance knowledge

comes in that you have heard over and over again. Advance knowledge. Did he have advance knowledge? And getting to what the Judge is going to charge you about advance knowledge, it goes like this: A person who aids and abets a crime of using or carrying a firearm — that is the gun charge we're talking about — in relation to a violent crime, same thing, can be found guilty even if the defendant did not personally use or carry the firearm. The reason there is an issue for you to decide even though everybody agrees that Mr. Hill didn't have a firearm is because they are saying this, that he aided and abetted.

But to be found guilty on this basis, this aiding and abetting basis, the defendant must have actively participated in the violent crime with advance knowledge. All right. So this is the law that is going to apply to frame the facts that you're to determine. Advance knowledge that another participant would use or carry a firearm during and in relation to violent crime.

A little more explanation about advance knowledge.

Advance knowledge means knowledge at the time when the defendant chose to begin or continue the defendant's participation in the violent crime. The defendant chose to continue the defendant's participation if the defendant learned of the firearm and continued to participate. What does that mean? The defendant did not choose to continue to participate

if the defendant learned of the firearm too late for the defendant to be reasonably able to walk away.

Well, when is too late and what is reasonable? Well, that is for you to decide. It is important here because you may recall I was asking questions, how long did all this take? The people who were actually present were kind of all over the map about how much time it was.

Well, because what is reasonable? I mean, at what point are you committed to the point that you can't back out? It is for you to determine. So that's the limitation on aiding and abetting liability that is specific to a 924(c) or a gun charge, the only thing that is left in this whole case and that is left for you to decide.

The second thing that I want to address about what the Government has remarked to you in their closing argument -- Mr. Ghose is the one who argued. Mr. Ghose told you that your decision is, did Mr. Hill have advance knowledge? That is what he told you your decision was, the decision of fact.

Ladies and gentlemen, that is not -- not, not, not the question. That is not the question. The question is whether you have a reasonable doubt about the Government's theory that he did have advance knowledge. Now, let's talk about that because it sounds like I'm saying the same thing maybe if you listen quickly and you don't process. But think about it. This is crucial.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I mean, half the things that go on in the world that are disputed and people fight about is because they miss what the real question is. And very often it is not what seems to be the question but an intermediate question. In this case, the question is whether or not you have a reasonable doubt, whether or not it is proven beyond a reasonable doubt. Think of it this way. If you're only supposed to do what the Government said you are supposed to do, which is decide whether he had advance knowledge, it is kind of like the scales are even. Is it slightly more likely that he had knowledge? Well, if that is the case, if it is 51 percent more likely, yeah, conviction. But that is not how our criminal justice system works. That is not how it is supposed to work. They have to prove it beyond a reasonable doubt. Now, I'm going to speak a little bit more about that burden of proof that they have in a second. So let me just leave that lie for a moment. It is not the issue that the Government has told you. Please understand what it is you are to decide.

Now, could I have Exhibit Number 21, please?

So another thing that the Government has stated to

you in their closing argument -- they made a statement -
Mr. Ghose made a statement of fact. And this is -- this is -
yeah.

Of course, what you're supposed to decide -- what the statement was was that the gun is visible to Ryan Hill. That is what you were just told. The gun is visible to Ryan Hill in Exhibit Number 21. Exhibit 21 doesn't tell you that. It is not visible in Exhibit 21. You can't see where that gun is.

Moreover, think about the circumstances. They are

Moreover, think about the circumstances. They are rushing in here. Hill doesn't see either one of them come through the door. So he doesn't see the guns come out of their clothing. And now he is coming in.

This is -- this is -- the best that the

Government can come up with in their attempt to prove to you

beyond a reasonable doubt that he had advance knowledge is that

maybe he discovered it right then. But it doesn't show you

that.

The Government-- Mr. Ghose -- talking about it impersonally the Government. But the Government has argued to you that, look, he comes in; he is as cool as a cucumber; he doesn't flinch.

Well, he doesn't flinch because he doesn't see the gun. He doesn't know that anything is amiss yet. I mean, what you are being told explains what Mr. Hill's version of events -- of events has been all the way through. Moreover, even if he could have seen then as he's trying to pull this bag out of his shirt and racing in, there's still a question to be decided, not by the Government but by you, about whether or not

this is too late to be able to reasonably withdraw. Remember, that is a limitation on the aiding and abetting liability, which is the only thing we have here.

Could I have Exhibit 13, please.

All right. Another thing that the Government has asserted to you in their closing argument is that that is what Mr. Hill saw. That is what Mr. Hill saw, as a way of saying to you, see, Mr. Hill early in the event knew there was a gun out there.

This picture, Exhibit Number 13, does not show you that that is what Mr. Hill saw. As a matter of fact, Mr. Hill is behind this person. He can't see the gun that is on the other side of this very large 6-6 person. There is no reason to make that assertion. The perspective is wrong.

If Mr. Hill had been standing where this camera is, maybe he would see the same thing you're seeing in this exhibit. But he wasn't. The Government just acknowledged that. He was where we just looked.

In addition, even if he did, there is still the question for you alone to decide. And that is, whether or not it was too late -- him becoming aware it was too late for him to be able to reasonably withdraw.

Another point from the Government's closing thus far is someone is going to die. And Mr. Hill heard that, as asserted to you. Well, did he? You heard the evidence. And

```
1
     I'm not going to repeat what every witness said about that.
 2
     But I will kind of summarize it all as being quite equivocal
     about whether or not Mr. Hill could have heard that.
 3
 4
               I'm talking about the witnesses who were standing
 5
     right there. In fact, one of the witnesses who was literally
     right behind the spot where this is supposed to have
 6
 7
     occurred --
 8
               You can take that down.
 9
               -- said I don't know if he could have heard it. And
10
     I understand some other witnesses went the other way. But this
11
     is not -- this is -- there's witnesses all over about that.
12
               But, again, it is not -- it is not dispositive of
13
     this case. Why? Because, first of all, you have to go from
14
     that to there is a gun involved -- someone is going to die --
15
     there is a threat being made to a gun being involved. Well, it
16
     could certainly be a qun. It doesn't necessarily need to be
17
     when you are standing next to somebody like Adeleye.
18
               But, okay, let's say there is a gun. When did it
19
     happen? Perhaps that is the -- that is the moment when it
20
     comes into Mr. Hill's brain that, oh, my goodness, this is not
21
     what we set up here.
22
               So there is no evidence in the whole case about when
23
    that happened in the process. And it is up to you, again, you
     alone, to decide whether or not it is too late to reasonably be
24
```

able to withdraw from the gun -- from the gun part. Not the

25

bank robbery part. From the gun. From aiding and abetting the others in the use of a gun.

The next thing that I want to comment on that the Government has said -- I'm looking over your head because there's clocks up there -- is, Mr. Norton said at the beginning of the case -- he told you that this was a takeover. But you heard this -- one of the witnesses for Wells Fargo, well, that is not how -- that is not what a takeover is at all.

I never used the phrase takeover. I didn't use that. What I said was strongarm. But if you'll recall -- and I know it is a couple of days ago -- but I told you then that this is a phrase that I just made up.

These guys didn't sit around saying, okay, guys, we can push a note; we can take out guns; we can do a strongarm. Which will it be? That discussion didn't happen. What they talked about doing was rushing in, grabbing the money, and rushing out. That is what they talked about doing. And to suggest that that is not among the possible ways that one -- that one can rob the bank is ridiculous.

I understand that the witness -- he seemed like a smart guy. He knows the system for Wells Fargo and how the videos are taken and all that kind of stuff. But you can't just say, well, this is the way it is. It is these certain categories, and that is all -- in the entire universe of all the bank robberies that ever occurred anywhere, it can only be

one of these two kinds. And it is not the kind Mr. Norton said; so, therefore, it had to involve the gun. No.

These guys are -- these guys don't have Ph.D.s in bank robbery. They don't look at it that way in advance.

Think about a mugging that doesn't involve a gun. Think about a purse snatching. Think about a sudden snatching of a cell phone. You read about that. That is a fairly common thing.

None of these involve guns.

And it makes a lot of sense that if you're going to do a robbery and you're not going to do it with a gun that you could do it by this kind of rushing in sort of intimidation thing. I mean, after all, if you can rob a bank just by slipping a piece of paper, wouldn't this be more effective and yet short of using a gun?

And I don't know why -- why this was stated. But it was stated to you that this was not a note job, slipping a note. I never said it was a note job. Obviously, it was an armed bank robbery. I mean, that is the only evidence you ever had. We don't deny that.

What we're saying is that Hill didn't set it up as being a bank robbery. And that sort of leads me to the last thing I want to say about the Government's presentation before I make a couple of comments to you about the burden of proof.

That is this assertion that Hill is the brains behind this operation. Really? You have seen all of this evidence.

```
1
     Is there -- is there any reasonable support in the evidence for
 2
     Hill being the brains behind the operation? The Government's
     own witnesses have said -- numerous of them -- that the
 3
 4
     ringleader, quote-unquote, was Adeleye. That the one, quote,
 5
     calling the shots, unquote, was Adeleye. The one giving
 6
     directions in the bank and pointing off and watch that guy is
 7
     Adeleye. From start to finish, this was Adeleye's operation.
 8
              As a matter of fact, Adeleye, remember, is the guy
 9
    who took the Fifth Amendment when asked about other bank
10
     robberies. It was Adeleye's idea -- Adeleye -- I'm not saying
11
     Adeleye came up with every single detail. Obviously the car
12
     issue came up, and Mr. Hill participated in that.
13
               But Adeleye -- if there was brains behind the
     operation -- there weren't a whole lot of brains, period, in
14
15
     this operation. But if there were any brains behind the
16
     operation, it was not Hill. It was Adeleye. Their own
17
     evidence says that.
18
               Now, let me say this about burden of proof.
19
     a little bit sort of zooming out, way out, and kind of
20
     abstract. And I hope you can follow this because it is really
21
     important because it frames what you are supposed to do.
2.2
               THE COURT: You need to stop for a moment?
23
               UNIDENTIFIED JUROR: Yes.
24
               THE COURT: Let's stop for a second. Let's just stop
25
     the clock.
```

1 Is anyone else uncomfortable? 2 (There was a brief pause in the proceedings.) (The unidentified juror exited the courtroom at 3 4 11:46 A.M. and reentered the courtroom at 11:48 A.M.) 5 THE COURT: Ready? 6 7 MR. NORTON: Okay. It was actually a good place to 8 take a little breather because I am sort of turning the page, 9 so-to-speak, to this subject of burden of proof. This relates 10 to your job here, your function here, the function of all of us 11 here as opposed to the specific facts in this case. 12 It is this: It is clear that the burden of proof is 13 on the Government. They have to prove the case. We don't have 14 to disprove the case. But there is another aspect to this burden of proof 15 16 that I want to speak to specifically and make sure that this is 17 ever present in your mind as you evaluate the evidence to correctly understand what the issue is, as I pointed out 18 earlier. 19 20 It is not just that they have to come forward with the evidence and we don't. It is that they have to come 21 22 forward with the evidence to a certain level. Certain level of 23 certitude, let's say. The question is, how sure are you? 24 Okay. The question is not does their version sound right or 25 not? The question is: How sure are you?

And the law actually speaks to that. And the instructions that the Judge will give you actually speak to that. And the answer is beyond a reasonable doubt. So I alluded earlier to, hey, the question can't simply be, is it 51 percent more likely? That kind of standard of proof does apply in some kinds of cases — civil cases. It is called a preponderance standard. But that is not what applies here.

This is a criminal case. And in a criminal case, the standard is different. It is beyond a reasonable doubt. That means that if you are left with a doubt about the case that the Government is trying to present to you, you should acquit.

Now, the word reasonable is in there. That just means you don't have to come up with some crazy notion of how it is possible he didn't do it. I mean, it has got to be reasonable doubt. But if you are left after reviewing all of the evidence with a reasonable doubt about what the Government is trying to convince you of, then you should acquit.

In fact, let me say this about the jury verdict form because this is subtle. But it actually bears this out. This is typical. The verdict form that you're going to get, the piece of paper that you actually fill out to render your verdict, the first item is, we find Ryan Vincent Hill, and there is a line for not guilty and a line for guilty. And you check one of those.

Well, what that -- what that is telling you is you notice it doesn't say guilty and innocent. It is saying guilty or not guilty when it means -- when it says not guilty, what it really means is not guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Not proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. That is what that means.

And let me explain. It is built into our whole system of justice, this idea, because we place a very high value in our justice system and our conceptions of justice in our society -- a very high value on trying to assure that there is not one of these awful situations where somebody is convicted and they are actually not guilty of it.

And so it is not a perfect system. There is no perfect system. I mean, we are dealing with probabilities here. We're dealing with how we can know something. Look, why do we have trials in the first place? We have trials because we don't absolutely know 100 percent. We have to listen to some evidence and come to a decision as best we can.

If we could know guilty or not guilty 100 percent, we wouldn't need a trial and you wouldn't have to be here. So that is not the system we have. That is why we have these standards of proof in place that have to be achieved.

So here -- here is the high value that is evinced in our whole system here. And it is this: If there is going to be a mistake made, for goodness sake, let's have the guilty

person go free rather than the innocent person be convicted.

Okay. That is what is built into this standard. So when I say how sure are you, are you sure beyond a reasonable doubt? That is what this means. That is why it is beyond a reasonable doubt.

If it were just kind of, you know, I think the Government's case is slightly more persuasive than what the defense is trying to suggest to us, we don't really -- it seems more likely, convict. If that were the system, then not in this trial but in all the trials everywhere there would be lots of innocent people sitting in jail. We don't want that. That is why we have this high standard. That is why we should hold the Government to this high standard. And that is why, even if you think he might be guilty but I have reasonable doubts, then you must acquit. Must find him not guilty.

Now, that is one thing I want to emphasize about the burden of proof. Here is something else. And this is sort of subtle, too. If you look around at this room, it is grand, it is palatial. And if you think about what you have gone through during yesterday and the day before and today, you see that this system is -- it is very -- it is set up to run in a very careful way.

You were segregated. You were given instructions not to talk with each other until it is time to deliberate. You're not supposed to intermingle. You're not supposed to talk with

```
1
     other people about the case and take all these precautions.
 2
    place a high degree of gravity on what we're about here.
     Because the consequences can be large because a person's on
 3
 4
     trial in a criminal case. It is serious business.
 5
               And I worry sometimes that when we come in and we
 6
     counter all this and we think about the prosecuting authority
 7
     here is the United States. It is the United States of America.
 8
     We're all patriotic Americans. I believe in the United States.
 9
    And this is the United States -- the prosecutor; right?
10
              Look at all of this. They brought charges against
11
    Mr. Hill. So we need to evaluate to see, you know -- our job,
12
     I guess, is to make sure the Government got it right. No.
13
     Please, please, please don't think about it that way. Your job
14
     is absolutely crucial here.
               It is your responsibility -- this is not -- you're
15
16
     not here to be kind of quality control inspectors for what the
17
     Government does. That is not what your function is. You're
     the sole trier of fact here. And I urge you -- I know you'll
18
19
     take that very seriously. But I want you to think about that
20
     when you think about what it is that you actually have to
21
     decide and remember it is not, you know, if the Government is
22
     right. It is do you have reasonable doubts.
23
               Now, I need to move along. I am doing some things
24
     out of order here, so bear with me. Now, about this trial,
25
    because this trial has been about bank robbery, which is a
```

little bit off actually because bank robbery is not an issue in this case. Well, you kind of can't help it because the bank robbery -- the events of the bank robbery are relevant because, you know, you can look at it. You can draw inferences from what you see.

But it also means that they get to retry the bank robbery. So you get to hear about the bank robbery over and over and over again. And it would be easy to think, well, you know, he did a bank robbery. We're not going to let this guy go.

Well, Mr. Hill is going to be sentenced for that bank robbery just like Mr. Adeleye. The only thing left is this gun charge. So it is very important to focus in on what the precise issue is.

Now, let me suggest to you that there are three -there are three time frames here that you have heard evidence
about. Let me make this distinction because this may actually
help you when you are trying to evaluate the different pieces
of evidence you get.

There's three time periods. The first is the time prior to walking into the bank. The second relevant time period is the time inside the bank. And the third time period is the time after.

Okay. So it is really before, during, and after. All right. If you will think of it that way and follow me

1 here, let me help with some of this evidence that you have 2 heard. All of the events that happened after I would say are almost irrelevant. And what I mean by that is he is no longer 3 4 aiding and abetting the use of a gun. I mean, for a lot of the 5 time that you have heard evidence about, the guns were gone. 6 They have been discarded. Remember, they were found. 7 I couldn't quite say it is totally irrelevant, 8 though. Because after all, they did recover two guns, and they charged with a gun. So the fact that there's two guns, of 9 10 course, it turns out that the Government is completely 11 conceding that he didn't actually have a gun himself. 12 But it is still relevant that they find two guns. 13 And you can look at those guns and match them up to what you 14 see in pictures and the bank. So you can say that it is relevant on that basis. 15 16 But, really, everything that happened after they 17 leave the bank doesn't have anything to do with the thing that 18 you're being asked to decide. So I urge you to give all of 19 that evidence very slight regard. Now let's talk about what is happening in the bank. 20 During this event -- during this -- you know, was it a minute 21 22 like one person said? Was it -- I think one of them went four 23 minutes. We don't know. 24 But what happened in the bank? Is it relevant?

Well, you can -- remember, the question is advance knowledge.

25

```
1
     Advance means before. Right? Not during.
                                                 So why is it
 2
     relevant?
               Well, it is relevant because you can watch what
 3
 4
     happens during the event and you can say, well, was there
 5
     advance knowledge based on this? You know, does this look like
 6
    Mr. Hill knew that there was guns is what it all comes down to.
 7
               And that is why you keep hearing about whether or not
 8
     there was planning and him being a mastermind and so on.
 9
     Because the inference you're being asked to draw is, well, yes,
10
     he knows all about this -- this is carefully orchestrated.
11
     This elaborate, as Adeleye said -- the word he used -- planning
12
     and, therefore, how could he not know? That is the inference.
13
     That is how you can say the evidence of what is happening in
14
    the bank is relevant.
               However, you can -- with regard to that evidence, you
15
16
     can easily overstate it. Let me do a little contrast for you
17
     on the events inside the bank versus after. Okay. During
18
     versus the after.
19
               I'm sorry. I lost my train of thought. Well, I was
20
     talking about the events during the -- during the robbery. The
     only question is whether or not there is advance knowledge.
21
22
     The evidence that you got of what happened during -- in the
23
     during period was the videos and the photographs that you saw
     over and over again. They have the people -- some of the
24
25
    people who were in the bank testify about what they saw.
```

Then what do you have about what happened before?

Remember, we're talking about advance knowledge. So that is

the time period that most -- is most pertinent. So let's think

about this. If you are going to give very slight weight to the

evidence you hear after, you are going to look and give some

weight to the evidence you hear about what is happening during

the event.

The most weight would go to what happened before.

And that is where the Government's case is, Number 1, extremely weak but, Number 2, full of holes. It is full of holes because of what you didn't hear. You heard Adeleye, and that is basically it. Adeleye talked about what happened.

So you're supposed to decide what these -- what these parties talked about before they go in to rob a bank based on what Adeleye says?

How about Xavier Shields? You didn't hear from him. He was in the middle of all this. Remember, he was in the switch car. It was his place that they went to. But there is no Xavier Shields. And Xavier Shields is in the exact same posture as Adeleye. As a matter of fact, he pled guilty. He is going to be sentenced just like Adeleye. He could come in here and do himself some good. Shields could. But he is not here. And he is one of few people in the world that could actually testify about what happened before so that you would have some understanding about whether or not there really is

some advance knowledge on the part of Hill, like the Government keeps asserting to you. That is Xavier Shields.

How about Connie Montoya? Connie Montoya was the guy that went out and cased this bank and went inside and came back and said, this is a great bank to rob. But then said, well, I don't want to be one of the people going in. I'll just be a lookout for you.

Connie Montoya is in the same situation as Adeleye. Where is Connie Montoya? He would be somebody that knew about what happened before. And that is the time period that is really relevant here to advance knowledge. Where is he? He didn't testify. You didn't hear from him.

How about Brown? Brown was a guy, remember, who not only had to have participated in talking about how we're going to go do this robbery, he actually had a gun. He had his own gun. They are not contending that gun came from Mr. Hill. But he would know something about that. Where is he? He didn't speak to you.

So the most relevant information out there that would help you decide the case is not there. It is perfectly permissible for you to consider not only the evidence and the inferences to be drawn from it but the inferences to be drawn from the absence of evidence.

Now, let me speak to during the event. I'll come back to that. You heard from Jerald Lawson. He reiterated to

you that the big guy was in charge. The big guy was not

Mr. Hill. Mr. Hill is probably 140 pounds soaking wet. It was

the guy you heard from, Adeleye.

With him, as with other witnesses, I tried to nail

With him, as with other witnesses, I tried to nail down the best I can, okay, when? When do you hear this threat that might be an audible signal that there is a gun in play? He couldn't say in terms of time. Well, what about percentage? Maybe 85 percent.

Well, it is for you to decide. But that -- I suggest to you that if that is the moment in time that Hill becomes aware that there's guns in play that it is too late for him to reasonably be able to walk away.

I'll mention this. This is a little bit of an aberration. You heard from Ayrion Chandler who said it was -- boom, it was loud. They came in. They were aggressive. The big guy -- he, too, said that the big guy was loud and rough. But his testimony is a little odd. Remember, he said he had the movie screen view. And he kept saying that everybody had guns.

Well, I perceived everybody had guns, he said. But even the Government is not saying that everybody had guns. The pictures don't say that everybody had guns. Well, he had his hands in his pocket.

Well, you know, this guy is a victim in the bank. So I understand that. But gee. There is -- there is not much

1 that is helpful from him. He said -- he said, well, who was 2 the third guy? Pointed to Ryan. He doesn't know that it was Mr. Ryan. He has no way of knowing. He was covered up. 3 4 just knows it was the smaller guy. 5 Now, you know it was Mr. Hill. I know it was Mr. Hill. Mr. Hill pled quilty to it. That is how we know. 6 7 But this guy didn't know. And I say that to say that he was --8 I would urge you to take his evidence this way: That he is very much primed to give the Government what -- what he thinks 9 10 will support the Government's position. That is why he's going 11 to talk about, oh, it was collective, it was planned, and that 12 sort of thing. 13 If I can leave him for a moment and jump back to what is happening afterwards. You know, there was a lot of 14 discussion during the case about all this stuff that is after 15 16 the event. It is not relevant. You know, it shouldn't come 17 in. Well, it actually tells you something that is 18 19 helpful. Because on the question of how much planning had to 20 go into this bank robbery, think about this: These guys leave 21 the scene. They don't have a getaway driver as such. One of 22 them is actually driving at least until they get to the switch 23 They do switch cars. 24 Then at some point, they know that law enforcement is

after them somehow. They don't necessarily know how do we have

25

```
1
     a tracker device. Is there a helicopter? Who knows.
                                                            But they
 2
     know that they are made, so-to-speak.
               Well, what happens next? They drive and try to
 3
 4
    elude.
             They go down towards 65. Adeleye says, go over here
 5
    behind this building. We're going to go through and see if we
     can find the tracking device and so on. Hill says, well, I
 6
 7
     know this area. Let's go over here. So they go to another
 8
    place. They unload all the stuff.
 9
               Then they leave there. They end up back at the
10
    village -- Avalon Ridge apartments. That is where they are
11
     supposed to end up. Then they jump into a van. They are going
12
     to escape from there.
13
               Well, they don't plan. They don't plan any of this.
     This is the point. They don't plan any of this. They don't
14
    plan to throw away all the money they just stole. They don't
15
16
    plan to go to this particular location in order to do that.
17
     They don't plan -- they perhaps plan to go to Avalon Ridge.
     But they don't plan to go there with the police in hot pursuit.
18
19
     They, therefore, don't plan to jump out and go get in this van
20
     that happens to be driven by Joe Montoya, a friend. And like
     Adeleye said, go take me to my car. They don't plan any of
21
22
     that stuff.
```

And yet it unfolds in a way -- I mean, they still get

caught eventually. But they don't get caught right there.

23

24

25

the ultimate issue you're supposed to decide. But it at least tells you that it doesn't take a great deal of advance planning like they are all sitting around a conference room somewhere, you know, as if this is Ocean's Eleven and we're going to pull the great heist in Las Vegas. It is not like that.

These guys -- the plan is we need three of us. We're going to rush in. We're going to grab the money, and we're going to rush out. Oh, and we're going to have a switch car; and, oh, I can't come up with a car, the switch car. Hill, can you do it? Yeah, I can do it. I'm getting rid of my car anyway. That is the plan. So that kind of planning does not tell you that there is advance knowledge on Hill's part specifically about using guns.

Now, let me go back and jump back to the during phase. The during phase -- the first -- maybe the second witness that you heard of who was in the bank was the guy right there with Adeleye. So he has got Adeleye all over him. This was the tall guy you may remember because I asked him how tall he was to compare with Adeleye. He said that he was -- I think he said he was 6-4 and that Adeleye might be taller.

He described Adeleye as the big guy, aggressive. He said that Hill may or may not have heard Adeleye's commands.

Although he is standing right there. He acknowledged that Adeleye is in between him and Hill. He also acknowledged that he couldn't say what Hill saw or didn't see. This is the guy

closest to the whole thing.

He also said that Adeleye was the ringleader, Adeleye was the coordinator, and Adeleye was calling the shots. I mention him in particular because you might say, well, gosh, at some point, you have got to be aware that there's guns. Well, yeah, at some point.

But everything that the Government keeps trying to tell you, well, it is at this point, it is at this point -- I can't tell you exactly what point. But I can say confidently that the Government hasn't proven beyond a reasonable doubt that they have -- that he had advance knowledge and that his discovery was at a time too late to be able to do anything about it. Now, not the bank robbery but about the gun.

You heard from Jordan Peyton actually this morning.

And, you know, it was kind of -- I was actually looking at
this. You know, you were shown this picture. This is 3 and 4.

Actually, if you want to put up -- put up 4 if you don't mind.

Remember, he said -- he is the guy -- well, his seat would have been over here to the left. And, remember, I had all that discussion -- this was just this morning. I had all this discussion about exactly where this chair was. If this is his desk, it is right there. So it is a few feet away from where he sits. It is out a little bit from the wall. The wall is out a little bit from the building.

Remember all that stuff? All I was trying to say
was, look, the scene did not look like this. And so having an
unobstructed view of exactly what was visible to you,
Mr. Witness -- forget Mr. Hill -- to you, Mr. Witness, is not
as it appears.

This big -- it is either this big sign or another big
sign was far closer to the door. So it is -- it is necessarily
obstructing the view for somebody who is not even at the seat
next to the wall but across the desk from it.

So I'm not saying that this guy, Jordan Peyton,

So I'm not saying that this guy, Jordan Peyton, doesn't know what he is talking about. What I'm saying is he doesn't have an unobstructed view. He is saying it as best he can about what he observed and when and so on. But he doesn't have an unobstructed view about exactly when the guns come out. And he cannot say -- he cannot tell you in any kind of convincing way how Mr. Hill as he is walking in would perceive this in such a way that Mr. Hill would be aware.

All right. I'm almost done. I just -- I wanted to say this last. So going back to the time period before, let's talk about Adeleye. I want to make sure you have what you need to be able to evaluate Mr. Adeleye.

Mr. Adeleye is the only evidence about where the gun came from before, the only direct evidence on advance knowledge. It is only Adeleye that said I got the gun from Hill despite the fact that Hill goes in without a gun. That

```
1
    makes no sense. Despite the fact that Adeleye says Hill
 2
     doesn't carry a gun. Well, where does this one come from? You
     never heard any of that. Was this gun reported stolen?
 3
 4
     never heard any of that. Whose gun was this? You never heard.
 5
               Adeleye says that -- he acknowledged he is trying to
 6
     get a 5K -- remember that? Substantial assistance of
 7
                  He's wants a break. He's angry at Hill.
     cooperation.
                                                             Adeleye
 8
     knows perfectly well this case was charged without him.
 9
     only reason he was in the case is because Hill put him in the
10
     case. And the only reason Hill put him in the case -- well,
11
     for one thing, it was just because he was being forthcoming
12
     right from the beginning -- but also because two guys were
13
     about to go to prison for something they didn't do if he didn't
14
     fess up and say who it was. Hill was willing to do that but
15
     not Adeleye.
16
               THE COURT: Sir, your time is up.
17
               MR. NORTON: All right. Thank you.
18
                            CLOSING ARGUMENT
19
               MR. GHOSE: All right. There are a lot of things I
20
     would like to respond to. But I think the way to begin -- the
    best way to begin is actually with video -- some of the video
21
22
     itself.
23
               And when I first spoke with you in my first closing,
     I said I'm just going to talk -- I didn't want to play the
24
25
     video. I think now after hearing what Mr. Norton said, I think
```

```
1
     it is appropriate to see some of this.
               The first one I want to show you is Exhibit Number 8.
 2
     This is the camera behind Vada Faniel's teller station.
 3
 4
                     (Playing of the videotape.)
 5
              MR. GHOSE: Pause.
              How long did that take for that to happen? How long
 6
 7
     did that take? You know that Ryan Hill is walking in, and he
     is seeing this because how can he not see it? And why do
 8
     people put their hands up? Because guns are pointed at them.
 9
10
               Can we have Exhibit 25, please?
11
                     (Playing of the videotape.)
               MR. GHOSE: Now, this is the clip that you heard and
12
13
     that you saw from the exterior. That is the bank robbers' car
    pulling up, backing into the handicap stop that you heard
14
    Ayrion Chandler describe. Who gets out first? Adeleye. Who
15
16
     gets out second? Bruce Brown. Who has the guns? Adeleye and
17
     Brown. And then who is that running in last? Ryan Hill.
18
               Okay. Now, please, Exhibit Number 11.
19
                     (Playing of the videotape.)
20
               MR. GHOSE: As you can see, this is the video -- you
     recall this one -- of the front door. Adeleye, gun comes out.
21
22
    Brown, gun is already out. Hill walking directly toward the
23
     teller station. What does -- what does Ryan Hill walk directly
24
     into?
25
               Exhibit 13, please.
```

1 That is what he walks into. Now, Mr. Norton is saying maybe he didn't see that gun because he's looking at it 2 from behind Mr. Adeleye. But you know what he is seeing? He 3 4 is seeing Remonte Griffin's hands up just like he is seeing 5 Vada Faniel's hands up and just like he's seeing the other two 6 customers' hands up. 7 Mr. Norton said that reasonable doubt -- I'm trying 8 to get this as precise as what he said. Reasonable doubt is 9 not some crazy notion. The crazy notion would be that Ryan 10 Hill didn't know that guns were involved in this robbery. That 11 is a crazy notion. What is reasonable is to conclude that he 12 knew. He knew the moment that he walked in and continued to 13 participate. 14 But the jury instruction that Judge Totenberg will read to you soon is that even if he didn't know that precise 15 16 moment that he walked in, if he started to participate in the 17 bank robbery and continued to participate in the bank robbery 18 after having learned that guns are involved in this bank 19 robbery, provided that he could still at that moment walk away, 20 he is still quilty. So please play Exhibit 11. I'm sorry. Not 11. 21 22 think it is Exhibit 10. 23 (Playing of the videotape.) 24 MR. GHOSE: Okay. This is the camera that shows what 25 is happening behind the teller counter. That is Remonte

1 Griffin's hands on the left. That is Kayode Adeleye jumping 2 the counter; Jay Lawson coming around. Ryan Hill is coming around in the blue gloves. What is happening alongside Ryan 3 4 Hill? You'll see it in a moment. Kayode Adeleye with a gun to 5 Vada Faniel. First his back. Then his chest. 6 Pause it. Pause it, please. 7 How close are they together? How close are they 8 together? The crazy notion is that Ryan Hill didn't know guns 9 were involved. Could he have still walked away? What is 10 stopping him from walking away if he doesn't want to 11 participate in an armed bank robbery and the use of a firearm 12 during a crime of violence? Nothing is stopping him. 13 But what does he do? As Jordan Peyton said, calm and 14 collected and he continued on. 15 Keep playing it, please. (Continuation of the playing of the videotape.) 16 17 MR. GHOSE: In a bank this size, as Adeleye shouts 18 instructions to people on the other side of the bank. 19 I need you to stop it, please. Exhibit 16. 20 What is happening here? You heard that Adeleye is pointing a gun at a teller who is at the drive-thru window who 21 22 is laying on the ground. What is Ryan Hill doing? 23 Do Exhibit 6. 24 This is a small space. Look how small that space is. 25 What is the crazy notion here? The crazy notion is that Ryan

Hill somehow didn't know that he was participating in a robbery involving guns.

All right. Now you can take that down. Thank you.

There's a few other points that I want to make. This is enough, ladies and gentlemen. This is enough to convict Ryan Hill. But you have more. And you don't just have Kayode Adeleye telling you what happened before the robbery. You have Ryan Hill himself.

You heard Ryan Hill's admissions, statements that he then adopted as true during his guilty plea to Counts 1 and 2. Mr. Moultrie read this into the record. He was under oath. It was after being advised of his rights by the Judge. That statement is the most reliable statement.

We don't need to bring in Xavier Shields and Connie Montoya and all these other people because Ryan Hill himself agreed that Connie Montoya was acting as a lookout. Ryan Hill agreed that Xavier Shields was waiting at a parking lot nearby the apartment building while the robbery took place. Ryan Hill agreed that Shields arrived at a lot in the white Mercedes AMG which was leased by Mr. Hill.

Ryan Hill agreed that after replacing the license plate of the Xterra with a stolen plate to elude law enforcement Hill and Adeleye and Brown fled the scene together in the AMG and Shields fled in the Xterra. Hill agreed that Montoya was nearby in a rented white minivan and that Shields

had met up at Shields' apartment. And Ryan Hill agreed that he was the driver of the white Mercedes.

And it goes on. So much of this has been already agreed to. What he doesn't agree to is what Xavier Shields or Kayode Adeleye provided to you, which is that he handed Hill that gun to use during that robbery.

But the circumstantial evidence is so strong even without that. Judge Totenberg will instruct you that circumstantial evidence is evidence that you can infer based on what you have seen.

What reasonable inferences can you make based on what you have seen? Given the level of planning before, during, and after the robbery, the reasonable inference is that Ryan Hill knew exactly what this was all about. You don't have to be a leader to have advance knowledge. But Ryan Hill was the leader. There were two more.

(There was a brief pause in the proceedings.)

MR. GHOSE: There's a few more points I want to make before I sit down, and the Judge will then instruct you, and you can begin your deliberation.

Did Kayode Adeleye seem credible to you? You are the best situated to judge his credibility. You sat here and listened to him testify. He was calm. He was collected. He was truthful. If he made a mistake, he acknowledged it. He may have made a mistake about that Buick. He acknowledged

1 that. 2 Did he seem like he was lying when everything that he is saying is corroborated by Ryan Hill's own statements about 3 4 what happened before, by the physical evidence that happened 5 afterwards, by what you saw for yourself using the video? Is 6 he credible? 7 Mr. Adeleye was asked about a sentencing reduction. And he seemed to think that he wasn't even sure if he could 8 9 still get it. Is that what was driving him to testify? Kayode 10 Adeleye testified, and everything else in this case 11 corroborated what he said. 12 Mr. Norton has argued that what happened afterwards 13 is irrelevant. But it is not. It corroborates what 14 Mr. Adeleye said, and it shows the level of planning that was 15 involved. 16 Now, there was one mention about Mr. Adeleye by him 17 pleading the Fifth. That is his constitutional right. He is 18 permitted to do that. It is when he was asked about other 19 criminal conduct, other bank robberies I believe. 20 But let's just suppose for a moment that you believe the defense's theory that Mr. Adeleye is a seasoned bank 21 22 robber. He's an expert. That appears to be what their theory 23 is. 24 If he is an expert, do you think that he would have

failed to have discussed the single most important fact about

25

```
1
     how you commit a takeover robbery? Guns. What is the key
     ingredient to a takeover robbery? Guns. And what did you hear
 2
     from him? The day before the robbery happened, they got suited
 3
 4
     up. They went to the bank. They were 100 feet away, I believe
 5
     he said, or 100 yards away.
               Connie Montoya then said there is an APD cruiser
 6
 7
     nearby. And they aborted the mission. They were this close to
 8
     going in. They had their guns. Adeleye gave his gun back to
 9
     Hill. They are that close, and he is a seasoned expert. And
10
     somehow Ryan Hill who is in on this is unaware of the key
11
     ingredient to a takeover robbery, which is firearms.
12
               It is not reasonable. That is not a reasonable
13
     conclusion. That is a crazy notion. The reasonable conclusion
     is that Ryan Hill knew, had advance knowledge of the use of
14
     firearms, and is guilty of Count 3. Thank you.
15
16
               THE COURT: Thank you, Counsel. Ladies and
17
    gentlemen, if anyone needs to use the restroom right now, let's
18
            If you need to, stand for a few minutes. But I would
19
     like to resume and give you the instruction in the next five
20
    minutes.
21
                     (The jury exited the courtroom at 12:27 P.M.,
                     and a brief break was taken.)
22
23
               THE COURT: I'm going to have the jury back.
24
     Gentlemen, we're going to have the jury back.
25
                     (The jury entered the courtroom at 12:33 P.M.)
```

CHARGE

2.2

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, first of all, thank you very much for your attention and your patience. There was a little bit of jumping up and down when we've had conferences when you have had to wait for us. You have been a great jury.

It is now my duty to instruct you on the rules of law that you must follow and apply in deciding the case. So closing arguments are through. You're going to go to the jury room and begin your discussions after I complete my instructions to you.

You can decide you're going to deliberate during lunch, or you can have lunch and just free your mind and do it afterwards. It is up to you. And that really is totally up to you as to how you're going to proceed.

But it will be your duty to decide whether the Government has proved beyond a reasonable doubt the specific facts necessary to find the defendant guilty of the crime charged in the superseding indictment in Count 3.

Your decision must be based only on the evidence presented here. And you must not be influenced in any way by either sympathy for or prejudice against the Government or the defendant.

And I want to assure you -- you can take notes of anything I say here. But I will give you a copy of my charge here as well.

You must follow the law as I explain it even if you do not agree with the law, and you must follow all of my instructions as a whole. You must not single out or disregard any of the Court's instructions on the law.

The indictment or formal charge against a defendant is not evidence of guilt. The law presumes every defendant is innocent. The defendant does not have to prove his innocence or produce any evidence at all. A defendant does not have to testify. And as the defendant, Ryan Vincent Hill, chose not to testify, you cannot consider that in any way when making your decision. The Government must prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. If it fails to do so, you must find Mr. Hill not guilty.

The Government's burden of proof is heavy. But it does not have to prove a defendant's guilt beyond all possible doubt. The Government's proof only has to exclude any reasonable doubt concerning the defendant's guilt. A reasonable doubt is a real doubt based on your reason and common sense after you have carefully and impartially considered all the evidence in the case.

Proof beyond a reasonable doubt is proof so convincing that you would be willing to rely and act on it without hesitation in the most important of your own affairs. If you are convinced that the defendant has been proved guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, say so. If you are not convinced,

say so.

As I said before, you must consider only the evidence that I have admitted into this case. Evidence includes the testimony of witnesses and the exhibits admitted. But anything the lawyers say is not evidence and is not binding on you.

You should not assume from anything I have said that I have any opinion about any factual issue in this case. Except for my instructions to you on the law, you should disregard anything I may have said during the trial in arriving at your own decision about the facts. Your own recollection and interpretation of the evidence is what matters.

In considering the evidence, you may use reasoning and common sense to make deductions and reach conclusions. You should not be concerned about whether the evidence is direct or circumstantial.

Direct evidence is the testimony of a person who asserts that he or she has actual knowledge of a fact, such as an eyewitness. Circumstantial evidence is proof of a chain of facts and circumstances that tend to prove or disprove a fact. There is no legal difference in the weight you may give to either direct or circumstantial evidence.

Now, when I say you must consider all the evidence, I do not mean that you must accept all the evidence as true or accurate. You should decide whether you believe what each witness has to say and how important that testimony was.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In making that decision, you may believe or disbelieve any witness in whole or in part or not at all. The number of witnesses testifying concerning a particular point does not necessarily matter. To decide whether you believe any witness, I suggest that you ask yourself a few questions. Did the witness impress you as one who was telling the truth? Did the witness have any particular reason not to tell the truth? Did the witness have a personal interest in the outcome of the case? Did the witness seem to have a good memory? Did the witness have the opportunity and ability to accurately observe the things he or she testified about? Did the witness appear to understand the questions clearly and answer them directly? Did the witness' testimony differ from other testimony or other evidence? What was the witness' manner while testifying? the witness' testimony contradicted by other testimony or evidence? You may also consider any other factors that bear on credibility or believability.

The Government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant was the person who committed the crime. If a witness identifies a defendant as the person who committed the crime, you must decide whether the witness is telling the truth. But even if you believe the witness is telling the truth, you must still decide how accurate the identification is.

I suggest that you ask yourself questions, such as:

Did the witness have an adequate opportunity to observe the person at the time the crime was committed? How much time did the witness have to observe the person? How close was the witness? Did anything affect the witness' ability to see? Did the witness know or see the person at an earlier time?

You may also consider the circumstances of the identification of a defendant, such as the way the defendant was presented to the witness for identification and the length of time between the crime and the identification of the defendant.

You shall also ask yourself whether there was evidence that a witness testified falsely about an important fact and ask whether there was evidence that at some other time a witness said or did something or did not say or do something that was different from the testimony the witness gave during the trial.

To decide whether you believe a witness, you may consider the fact that the witness has been convicted of a felony or a crime involving dishonesty or a false statement.

But keep in mind that a simple mistake does not mean a witness was not telling the truth as he or she remembers it. People naturally tend to forget some things or remember them inaccurately. So if a witness misstated something, you must decide whether it was because of an innocent lapse in memory or an intentional deception. The significance of your decision

may depend on whether the misstatement is about an important fact or about an unimportant detail.

You must consider some witnesses' testimony with more caution than others. For example, witnesses who hope to gain more favorable treatment in their own cases may have reason to make a false statement to strike a good bargain with the Government.

Further, in this case, the Government has made plea agreements with certain codefendants in exchange for their testimony. Such plea bargaining, as it is called, provides for the possibility of a lesser sentence than the codefendant would normally face. Plea bargaining is lawful and proper, and the rules of this Court expressly provide for it.

So while witnesses of this -- this kind may be entirely truthful when testifying, you should consider that testimony with more caution than the testimony of other witnesses.

And the fact that a witness has pled guilty to an offense is not evidence of the guilt of any other person.

After examining all of the evidence, if you have a reasonable doubt that the defendant was the person who committed the crime, you must find the defendant not guilty.

You will see that the indictment charges that certain crimes were committed on or about a certain date. The Government does not have to prove that the offense occurred on

an exact date. The Government only has to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the crime was committed on a date reasonably close to the date alleged. The word knowingly means that an act was done voluntarily and intentionally and not because of a mistake or by accident.

I caution you that the defendant is on trial only for the specific crime charged in Count 3 of the superseding indictment. You are here to determine from the evidence in this case whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty of that specific crime. So while you're going to have the indictment that includes Counts 1, 2, and 3, you're only -- the only charge in front of you to decide is Count 3.

You must never consider punishment in any way to decide whether the defendant is guilty. If you find the defendant guilty, the punishment is for the Judge alone to decide later, meaning me.

You will see that the indictment given to you for your review during your deliberation charges several criminal offenses called counts against multiple defendants. And, again, I caution you that the only criminal offense at issue is whether defendant Hill committed the offense charged in Count 3, which charges his use or carrying a firearm during and in relation to a violent crime.

It is a separate federal crime to use a firearm during and in relation to a violent crime. The defendant can

be found guilty of this crime only if all of the following facts are proven beyond a reasonable doubt: First, that the defendant committed the violent crime charged in Count 2 of the superseding indictment. That is, the armed bank robbery. And, secondly, during and in relation to that crime, the defendant knowingly used or carried a firearm as charged in the superseding indictment.

In this superseding indictment, the defendant is charged with using or carrying a firearm during and in relation to a violent crime. That is, the armed bank robbery, which the armed bank robbery is charged in Count 2. I instruct you that the defendant has previously pled guilty to Count 2 of the superseding indictment.

A firearm is any -- again, that he has pled guilty -- that means to the armed bank robbery.

A firearm is any weapon designed to or readily convertible to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive. To use a firearm means more than a mere possession and more than proximity and accessibility to the firearm. It requires active employment of the firearm by brandishing or displaying it in some fashion. I will further explain brandishing to you in a moment.

To carry a firearm is to have the firearm on one's person or to transport the firearm such as in a vehicle from one place to another while committing the violent crime. To

use or carry a firearm in relation to a crime means that the firearm had some purpose or effect with respect to the crime and was not there by accident or coincidence. The firearm must have facilitated or had the potential of facilitating the crime.

If you find the defendant guilty of using or carrying a firearm during and in relation to a violent crime, you will answer an additional question about the firearm, whether the firearm was brandished. The Government has the burden of proof on this question, and the standard again is proof beyond a reasonable doubt.

It is possible to prove the defendant guilty of a crime even without evidence that the defendant personally performed every act charged. Ordinarily, any act a person can do may be done by directing another person or agent, or it may be done by acting with or under the direction of others.

A defendant aids and abets a person if the defendant intentionally joins with the person to commit a crime. A defendant is criminally responsible for the acts of another person if the defendant aids and abets the other person. A defendant is also responsible if the defendant willfully directs or authorizes the acts of an agent, employee, or other associate.

But finding that a defendant is criminally responsible for the acts of another person requires proof that

the defendant intentionally associated with or participated in the crime, not just proof that the defendant was simply present at the scene of the crime and knew about it or knew about it.

In other words, you must find beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant was a willful participant and not merely a knowing spectator.

Further, a defendant who aids and abets the crime of using or carrying a firearm during and in relation to a violent crime can be found guilty even if the defendant did not personally use or carry the firearm. But to be found guilty on this basis, the defendant must have actively participated in the violent crime with advance knowledge that another participant would use or carry a firearm during and in relation to the violent crime.

Advance knowledge means knowledge at a time when the defendant chose to begin or continue the defendant's participation in the violent crime. The defendant chose to continue the defendant's participation if the defendant learned of the firearm and continued to participate. But the defendant did not choose to continue to participate if the defendant learned of the firearm too late for the defendant to be reasonably able to walk away.

Now, if you find the defendant guilty of using or carrying a firearm during or in relation to a crime of violence, you must also determine if the defendant brandished

the firearm during and in relation to a crime of violence. To brandish a firearm means to show all or part of the firearm to another person or otherwise make another person aware of the firearm in order to intimidate that person. The firearm may not be directly visible to the other person.

The defendant is guilty of aiding and abetting the brandishing of a firearm if he had advance knowledge that another participant in the crime would display or make the presence of a firearm known for the purposes of intimidation. The defendant need not have had advance knowledge that a participant would actually brandish the firearm. This requirement is satisfied if the defendant knew that a participant -- a participant intended to brandish a firearm to intimidate if the need arose.

You have been permitted to take notes during the trial. Most of you, perhaps all of you, have taken advantage of that opportunity. You must use your notes only as a memory aid during deliberations. You must not give your notes priority over your independent recollection of the evidence. And you must not allow yourself to be unduly influenced by the notes of other jurors. I emphasize that notes are not entitled to any greater weight than your memories or impressions about the testimony in evidence.

Your verdict, whether guilty or not guilty, must be unanimous. Everyone must agree. In other words, you have to

come to consensus if that is -- if that is -- if you can. Your deliberations are secret. And you will never have to explain your verdict to anyone.

Each of you must decide the case for yourself but only after fully considering the evidence with the other jurors. So you must discuss the case with one another and try to reach an agreement. While you are discussing the case, do not hesitate to reexamine your own opinion and change your mind if you become convinced that you are wrong. But do not give up your honest beliefs just because others think differently or because you simply want to get the case over with.

Remember that in a very real way you are the judges, judges of the facts. Your only interest is to seek the truth from the evidence in this case.

When you get back to the jury room, choose one of your members to act as a foreperson. The foreperson will direct your deliberations and will speak for you in court. Please only deliberate in the jury room, not in the lunchroom downstairs or obviously in the hallways, and only deliberate when all of you are present.

A verdict form has been prepared for your convenience, and I'm going to go over it with you very briefly here. So the first question as the defendant is charged in Count 3 of the superseding indictment, which you'll have, we, the jury, find the defendant Ryan Vincent Hill not guilty or

guilty.

Now, if you find the defendant not guilty as charged in Count 3, then you're just going to go ahead to the very end, so say we all, signed and dated. The foreperson will sign, and you don't have to answer Question 2. In other words, don't answer Question 2.

If you find the defendant guilty of Count 3, then you have to answer the question that is identified under Question 2. And there it is asking you to find with respect to Count 3 whether the firearm was not brandished or was it brandished. You'll use again -- refer back to my instruction to you as to how you decide that.

You'll have the verdict form and the evidence brought back to you as well as my instructions to the jury room. And when you have agreed on a verdict, if you have agreed, your foreperson must fill in the form, sign it, date it, and notify the security officer from the marshal's office. And it will be carried in. And then I will read the verdict here in the courtroom.

Now, if you wish to communicate with me at any time, please write down your message or question and give it to the marshal and the foreperson should sign it. The marshal will bring it to me, and I will respond to it as promptly as possible either in writing or by talking to you in the courtroom. And you'll come back here, and the counsel will be

```
1
    present, and I'll read the question, and I'll respond to you,
 2
     and I usually will have reviewed the question with them in
 3
     advance.
 4
               But I caution you to not tell me how many jurors have
 5
     voted one way or the other at any time during the deliberation
 6
    process. All right.
 7
               All right. Well, that is it. So you're on your own
 8
    at this juncture. And you can decide how you are going to
 9
     proceed again as to lunch. And Ms. McConochie will bring
10
     everything to you.
11
               Thank you very much again.
                     (The jury exited the courtroom at 12:55 P.M.)
12
13
               MR. GHOSE: I think we need to dismiss the alternate
14
     jurors.
               THE COURT: Is there any objection to my dismissing
15
16
     the alternate jurors? It doesn't seem like they are going to
17
    be here forever. We have got everyone in attendance.
18
               Do either of you have any -- either side have any
19
    objection?
20
               MR. GHOSE: No objection, Your Honor.
21
               MR. NORTON: That would be normal course anyway if
22
     they are about to go deliberate; right?
23
               THE COURT: Well, if it is a trial where we think
24
     things may go on and we have had trouble with attendance, I
25
    would keep the jurors -- the alternate jurors present.
```

```
1
               COURTROOM DEPUTY CLERK: I can keep them in the jury
 2
     lounge.
                           They can be kept in the jury lounge if
 3
               THE COURT:
 4
     you want when they go down to lunch.
 5
               MR. GHOSE: Yeah, we would ask that they be kept in
 6
    the jury lounge. But, obviously, they can't deliberate.
 7
               THE COURT: All right. That's fine. Sometimes they
 8
    prefer that because they like to go back and talk to their
     fellow jurors about the verdict also. That is fine.
 9
10
               I'm even -- if they have a question, I'm not
11
     answering it for an hour.
                     (A lunch break was taken.)
12
13
                     (Deliberations began at 2:00 P.M.)
                     (The proceedings reconvened at 4:04 P.M., as
14
15
                     follows:)
16
               THE COURT: Hello. Have a seat. So I have a note
17
     from the jury. It says, if he knew that guns were being used
     during the robbery, when was the last point he could have
18
19
     walked away and not been charged with this particular crime?
20
    Can we watch the video from start to finish? Signed by the
     foreperson.
21
22
               So I'll have the jury in. Yes, they can watch the
23
     video, first of all. And they can watch it in here. And
    Ms. McConochie can stop it at any point for them. And I'll
24
25
     just tell them to not converse while she's present. And, of
```

```
1
     course, they can huddle around the little computer later on if
 2
    they want to take it back.
 3
               And then in respect to the question when was the --
 4
    as to when was the last point he could have walked away, I'm
 5
    going to -- my proposal is to tell them that is for them to
     determine based on the totality of the evidence in front of
 6
 7
     them.
 8
               MR. NORTON: I think that is the law.
 9
               THE COURT: Any objections to the way of proceeding
10
    that I've suggested?
11
               MR. GHOSE: No, Your Honor.
12
               MR. NORTON: No, Your Honor.
13
               THE COURT: All right. Should we have the jury back
14
     in?
               I need to know whether there is one continuous
15
16
    exhibit or --
17
               MR. GHOSE: No, there isn't. There are six different
18
    videos.
19
               THE COURT: How will they know which ones?
20
               MR. GHOSE: I'm not sure which one they want to
21
             I mean, there is the one of the front door. And then
22
    there's five from the interior.
23
               THE COURT: Just one second.
               Then there's five what?
24
25
               MR. GHOSE: Five behind the teller counter. It is
```

```
1
     Exhibit 7 through 12. The relevant parts are really under a
 2
    minute long for each video. I mean, they are four minutes long
 3
     total.
 4
               THE COURT: But they were trying to watch the video
 5
     from start to finish. Is there a video from start to finish?
               MR. GHOSE: They all are from start to finish. It is
 6
 7
     just that on some of the videos the action only occurs for one
 8
    minute out of the four minutes. So they are going to sit there
 9
    watching nothing happen for a couple of minutes.
10
               THE COURT: All right. Is there one that shows it
11
     from start to finish?
12
               MR. GHOSE: There is the one that shows -- I mean,
13
    you have seen them, Your Honor.
14
               THE COURT: I know. I just don't know --
               MR. GHOSE: Exhibit 7 is the -- well, actually I'm
15
16
     not sure. I'm not sure which is which. I would have to look
17
    at my list. But one shows the front door. One shows behind
     the counter. And the others just show the various teller
18
19
     counters.
20
               THE COURT: One is from the front door. One from the
21
     counter.
22
              MR. GHOSE: There's one that shows the front door.
23
     There's one that shows behind the counter, like the floor area
     where the safe is. And then there are four that show each of
24
25
    the different teller positions.
```

```
THE COURT: Okay. And do they go for the whole --
 1
 2
     even if they don't show anything of interest for five minutes
 3
    or four?
 4
              MR. GHOSE: Yeah. Each video is a four-minute
 5
     segment. But the robbery only took place -- the robbery only
 6
     took under two minutes. So I wouldn't even bother with the
 7
     second half of any videos. I would suggest that they just
     watch the first two minutes of each of the six videos.
 8
 9
               MR. NORTON: It is about two minutes.
10
               MR. GHOSE: Two minutes, 30 seconds.
11
                     (There was a brief pause in the proceedings.)
12
               THE COURT: What does 4:10 mean when it says
13
     something starts at 4:10? Is that just --
14
               COURTROOM DEPUTY CLERK: Surveillance video camera
    three starting 4:10.
15
16
               MR. GHOSE: Yeah. That is sort of like before the --
17
    before the videos were excerpted, that was like my note to
18
    myself about what part of the video the relevant points start.
19
               THE COURT: All right. Do you all mind my telling
20
     the jury that the length is two minutes -- what did you say?
21
               MR. NORTON: It appears to be right at two minutes,
22
    almost 30 seconds from the time it appears that people are
23
     seeing the people come in the bank until the time they appear
24
    to have gone.
25
               THE COURT: Is that correct?
```

```
1
               MR. GHOSE:
                          That sounds correct to me, yes.
 2
               THE COURT: Okay. And so these are fragments of the
     two minutes, 30 seconds, or are they two minutes, 30 seconds
 3
 4
    but you just don't see anything for parts of the time?
 5
               MR. GHOSE: I can give you a little more detail.
     Your Honor, Exhibit 11 is the video that shows the front door.
 6
 7
     That is about a four-minute video, three-minute video. But the
 8
     relevant part is about two minutes and 30 seconds. I would
 9
     suggest showing that one first.
10
               The next one that I would suggest showing is Exhibit
11
    Number 8. That is the teller camera behind Vada, who is the
12
    witness who was approached by Mr. Adeleye. That is about --
13
     again, that is only -- that is under three minutes long -- that
     one. And the first two minutes and 30 seconds would be the
14
     relevant portion.
15
16
               The one I would suggest showing next is Exhibit
17
    Number 10. That shows behind the counter, and it sort of shows
18
     the floor area. But that is three minutes long, and most of
     that is relevant.
19
20
               THE COURT: Okay.
               MR. GHOSE: The last three videos don't show a whole
21
22
     lot, frankly. But you can still play them. Exhibit 9,
     Exhibit 12, and Exhibit 7. They show the teller stations that
23
24
     are either unoccupied or occupied by the other teller who
25
    didn't testify.
```

```
1
               THE COURT:
                           Okay. Very good. Do you have any
 2
     objections to that suggestion?
 3
               MR. NORTON: No, Your Honor.
 4
               THE COURT: All right.
 5
               MR. GHOSE: Your Honor, do you want me to play them,
 6
    or do you want to play them from the actual exhibits that are
 7
     in evidence? Because I have my computer and I could play them.
 8
               THE COURT: I think I need to just allow
 9
    Ms. McConochie to play them outside all of our presence for
10
     them so they can -- even if they are nudging each other that
11
     they can nudge each other and do whatever, unless there are
12
     objections to that.
13
               MR. GHOSE: No, Your Honor.
               THE COURT: If she has trouble with the video,
14
     then --
15
16
               MR. MOULTRIE: Do you want us to wait?
17
               THE COURT: No.
                     (The jury entered the courtroom at 4:17 P.M.)
18
19
               THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, I have your
20
    message. I'm sorry it has taken a little while to get back to
21
          I always try to consult with counsel to give them an
22
     opportunity to express their opinion before I speak to you
23
     about a matter like this.
24
               Yes, you can watch the video. And which there are
25
     apparently six videos. And, you know, they are from different
```

1 perspectives. And the parties have authorized me to tell you 2 that the video -- the whole action from start -- from entry until the end of departure lasts approximately two minutes and 3 4 30 seconds. They are longer than that, so there is sometimes 5 no action. So they have given me a suggested sequence with the front door -- video of the front door -- from the front door 6 7 perspective being the first one; the one from the teller's 8 perspective, the first witness, Vada, being next; the next one 9 being behind the counter at the floor level; and then the last 10 two, which you may or may not want to look at -- and you can 11 stop at any point. Of course, that is up to you -- being from 12 the teller -- other teller stations. Some of which were 13 unoccupied. 14 So some of the times you're not going to see that much from some of them. But we have tried to -- that order is 15 16 so that you will see the most, and you can see all of them 17 obviously. Our thought was that maybe so that you're not 18 19 huddling around the little laptop, all 12 of you, that I would 20 excuse everyone from the courtroom, other than Ms. McConochie, and she would show them, and you could -- any of you could ask 21

But we would ask you not to discuss it while you're -- while she is present in order to ensure the confidentiality of your discussions. And then you can always,

22

23

24

25

her to stop at any time.

1 if you feel like you need to, bring it back on the laptop and 2 say, this is what I'm talking about. You can do that. But 3 this way everyone can see it together. 4 If you would prefer just to take the laptop back, you 5 can do that also. So yes, you can look at it. As to the other question, which was, if he knew that 6 7 guns were being used during the robbery, when was the last 8 point he could have walked away and not been charged with the 9 particular crime? 10 Well, actually that is for you to decide based on the 11 totality of evidence in front of you. That is precisely what 12 the jury has to decide. And, obviously, you're not the ones 13 charging but you're finding that -- making that finding. So do you want to just go back for a second and 14 15 decide whether you want to look at it as a group in here or the 16 laptop back or --17 UNIDENTIFIED JUROR: Watch it here. THE COURT: All right. We have our marching orders 18 19 then. So if Ms. McConochie has any trouble, she will get in 20 touch with you all to show them. COURTROOM SECURITY OFFICER: All rise. Court is in 21 22 recess. 23 THE COURT: I just had one last thing to say. You 24 can stay as long as you want today in terms of your 25 deliberations, and, of course, you can come back tomorrow

```
1
     morning. Whatever you want.
 2
               UNIDENTIFIED JUROR: If we come back tomorrow, is
     there a certain time we need to back in the morning or could
 3
 4
     we --
 5
               THE COURT: No. You could decide you want to come
     back a little bit later if that is more convenient. You can
 6
 7
     judge how much you have to do to work out. Just let me know
     because I think tomorrow, in fact, I probably won't be here
 8
 9
     until 10:15 myself. All right.
                     (The proceedings were adjourned at 4:21 P.M.,
10
                     and the jury continued their deliberations
11
12
                     until 5:22 P.M.)
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
4	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
5	
6	I, SHANNON R. WELCH, RMR, CRR, Official Court Reporter of
7	the United States District Court, for the Northern District of
8	Georgia, Atlanta Division, do hereby certify that the foregoing
9	463 pages constitute a true transcript of proceedings had
10	before the said Court, held in the City of Atlanta, Georgia, in
11	the matter therein stated.
12	In testimony whereof, I hereunto set my hand on this, the
13	17th day of March, 2017.
14	
15	
16	
17	SHANNON R. WELCH, RMR, CRR
18	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
19	ONTIED STITLE DISTRICT COOK
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	